

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXX.

SEPTEMBER, 1935.

No. 3.

PISCATTAWAY.

By WILLIAM B. MARYE.

PART ONE: *The Piscattaway People.*

The Piscattaway Indians (Pascattaways, Pascaticons, etc.) were a people of Algonquian stock who, at the time of the founding of Maryland (1634) and for some years later, lived on the banks of a creek of Potomac River, which still bears their name, and on the river itself near the mouth of that creek. Their chief was called by them the "tayac" (*Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 131). To the English he was always known as the "emperor." This grandiose title was not due to a complete failure on the part of the English invaders of his country to appreciate the true rank of the "tayac" from a worldly point of view. Rather it resulted from the custom of styling as "kings" all of the ordinary Indian chieftains. Starting with this somewhat grandiloquent title, our antecedents had to find some word to designate an Indian chief who ruled over "kings," and "emperor" was the only word which seemed to fit the subject. Having begun with an exaggeration, they ended in an absurdity. Nevertheless, the rank and influence of this Indian "emperor" had sufficient prestige to promote a certain delusion of grandeur in Giles Brent, so that he would talk of the "cowne and scepter of Pascattaway" (*Maryland Archives*, Volume XV, folio 124), an idea which appears only the more strange when it is recalled that the Indians themselves had no conception of

the meaning of a crown and used no object which in any way corresponded with it.

The ruling powers of the Province of Maryland acknowledged the station and authority of three Indian "emperors." The emperor of Piscattaway was the only one of them who lived and held sway on the Western Shore. The other two, the Emperor of Nanticoke and the Emperor of Assateague, lived on the Eastern Shore. The power of these native potentates did not always by any means extend to all of the Indian peoples of the colony. New peoples were occasionally added to the list of their subjects, but the numbers of the whole diminished rapidly.

In 1639 the domain of the tayac, or emperor of Piscattaway, was said to extend a distance of one hundred and thirty miles (see "Annual Letters of the Jesuits" in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 125). This meant, of course, the length of the territory measured from east to west and it must have been an estimate of the distance as measured along the Maryland shore of the Potomac River, and not in a straight line. It is dubious if at this time the emperor's influence extended so far as to include Anacostia. Captain Henry Fleete, writing in 1632, has informed us that the emperor of Piscattaway had little use for the "Nacostines," that is, the Anacostans, but feared to vent his spleen upon them because they enjoyed the protection of the "Massomacks," "or Cannyda Indians," that is to say, of the Five Nations ("The Journal of Henry Fleete" in Neill's *Founders of Maryland*, p. 25). At this juncture it is necessary to call attention to an error in an otherwise excellent work, *Landmarks of Old Prince William*, by Fairfax Harrison. Mr. Harrison doubts if there was any real difference between the Piscattaways and the Anacostans, but cites the passage in Fleete's journal as evidence of an enmity which existed between the last named people and Powhatan (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. 1, p. 19). It is clear from the context, however, that the "emperor," to whom Fleete refers, was not Powhatan, but the Emperor of Piscattaway. For one thing, his home, the town in which he lived, was on Potomac River. This fact leaves

no doubt as to his identity, if any existed. Some time after the founding of Maryland the Piscattaways "buried the hatchet" so far as concerned the Anacostans, and those of that people who remained in Maryland and had not gone to join their Iroquois protectors in the north, were incorporated with them.

The *Maryland Archives* furnish us with the names, as of 1666 and 1668, of the various Indian peoples who acknowledged the suzerainty of the Emperor of Piscattaway (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 25; Vol. V, p. 34). Among these names we find notably those of the Mattawomans, the Chopticos, the Portobaccos, the Nanjemoyas and the Anacostans. The Pamunkeys are conspicuously lacking, but of this there seems to me to be a simple explanation, which is that they were included in the list as Piscattaways proper.

In that well known passage in the *Maryland Archives*, dated December 20th, 1660, wherein their manner of choosing their tayaes or emperors is elucidated for the benefit of Governor Philip Calvert, the Piscattaways make very considerable claims not only for the antiquity of their league, but also for its former physical extent (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 402-403). The author of the article on the Piscattaways or Conoys in the *Handbook of American Indians* interprets this passage to mean that, perhaps, the league was founded about the beginning of the sixteenth century (*Handbook of American Indians*, Vol. 1, p. 339, Bulletin 30, Bureau of American Ethnology). At all events, if the Piscattaways spoke in good faith on this occasion, and they had no particular reason to do otherwise, their league antedated the founding of Maryland by a great many years. Their claim, that their emperor formerly had power over the Susquehannocks was, of course, a trivial boast. Not so, however, their mention of the Potomas as his former subjects. These last were, perhaps, the principal people of the south shore of Potomac River. In early historical times they appear to have been brought within the Powhatan confederacy (*Handbook of American Indians*, Vol. 2, p. 294). This, so far as I have been able to ascertain, was not certainly ever true

of the Piscattaways and their confederates of the eastern bank of the river, although Harrison holds a contrary opinion (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. 1, p. 19). Evidence in support of the Piscattaways' claim in regard to the Potomacs is found in a paragraph contained in a letter of the Governor and Council of Virginia to the Board of Trade, bearing date January 30th, 1624:

"Have also revenged the treachery of the Pascaticons and their associates, *the greatest people of those parts*, for cutting off Captain Spilman and Mr. Puntis' pinnace and murdering great numbers of their ancient allies, the Patowmacks" (*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1574-1660*, p. 56).

A somewhat earlier (1622) reference to the "Pazaticans" will be found in the works of Captain John Smith, where it is stated that they and the "Patawmek" were then "mortall enemies" (*Works of Captain John Smith*, Arbor Edition, p. 586).

These, the above cited, are, so far as my experience goes, the earliest instances of the mention of the Piscattaway people by forms of the name under which they have since gone in history.

Of the numbers of the Piscattaways and their allies down the long succession of years of the historical period from 1608 to 1697 it is impossible to give a good and consistent account. Semmes estimates the number of Indians living on the east bank of the Potomac (tidewater section) at the time of Captain John Smith's voyage of exploration in the Chesapeake (1608) at nine hundred ("Aboriginal Maryland," by Raphael Semmes, in *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XXIV, p. 208). Captain Henry Fleete, in his Journal of 1631-1632, informs his readers of the "poore number of natives which are in Patomack and places adjacent, where are not above five thousand persons" ("The Journal of Henry Fleete" in Neill's *Founders of Maryland*, p. 25). Later on he tells us how the "Pascatowies" had suffered a "great slaughter formerly . . . to the number of one thousand persons in my time" at the hand of the "Massomacks" or Iroquois. Father White is authority for the statement that, on

his first visit to Piscattoway (1634), Governor Leonard Calvert was met at the water side by five hundred bowman (Father White's " Briefe Relation " in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 40, 41). I can not but believe, however, with all due deference to the author of this statement, that it exaggerates the facts. The anonymous author of " A Relation of Maryland " merely says that Governor Calvert found " many Indians assembled " to greet him on the occasion of his historic visit to Piscattaway (*ibid.*, p. 72). Whatever their numbers at the time of the founding of Maryland, the Piscattaways and their allies certainly declined in number subsequently to this event. In the year 1670, on presenting a petition to Philip and William Calvert for a renewal of their league of peace with Maryland, the representatives of the Piscattaways apologized for the poor value and quantity of the presents then offered according to Indian custom, alleging that " now they are reduced to a small number and therefore they cannot present any thing considerable " (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 65). In the year 1676 the government made a present of eighty matchcoats to the Piscattaways (exclusive of the Pamunkeys and the Mattawomans) as a reward for their services in the campaign against the Susquehannocks. The implication seems to be that eighty Piscattaway warriors took part in and survived this campaign (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 489). Sir Thomas Lawrence, in a letter to the Earl of Bridgewater, dated March 25th, 1697, makes the statement that the Piscattaway Indians and their associates, the Mattawomans and the Chopticos, number altogether not above eighty or ninety (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 256; see also *Calendar of State Papers, America and West Indies*, 1694-1697, p. 425). This estimate I believe to be below the true number; for in 1699, when the Piscattaways, minus all of their former allies, were living on Conoy Island at Point of Rocks in Potomac River, Giles Vandicastle and Burr Harrison, who visited them there, reported to the Governor of Virginia that they found twenty Indian men, twenty women and thirty children at the fort on the island, while others were

said to be absent in quest of game, and they estimated the number of bowmen available to be "not above eighty or ninety" (*Virginia State Papers*, 1652-1781, p. 63). Colonel Smallwood, of Maryland, who visited the island in 1704, reported that he had been informed of a "great mortality" among the Indians there, "to the number of fifty seven men, women and children dead" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXVI, p. 376).

The causes of the diminution in numbers of the Maryland Indians were various. While nothing like the great massacre of the Piscattaways reported by Henry Fleete occurred after the founding of the colony, all sorts of things combined to bring about the rapid decline of the native peoples. Governor Nicholson, writing in the year 1697, concerning the Indian population of Maryland, declares that smallpox was one of the causes of its then rapid decrease; but adds: "the great cause of all is their (the Indians) being so devilishly given to drink" (*Calendar of State Papers, America and the West Indies*, 1694-1697, p. 425). This statement scarcely came with a very good grace from a Governor of Maryland. The three representatives of the Piscattaway Indians who, in 1670, as noted above, came to St. Mary's with a petition for a renewal of their treaty of peace, were sent back to Piscattaway with three matchcoats and *two gallons of rum*. In 1692 the Emperor and "great men" of Piscattaway and other Indian towns (not named) complained to the Council of the "irregularity of their young Men when they get drunk" and desired "the Prohibition of carrying Rum and other strong Drink among them for the future" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. VIII, p. 327). Other reasons for the melting away of Maryland's Indian population were the wars made upon the native people by neighboring Indians and by the Five Nations (an old affair) and their wars and petty strife with the English. As they diminished in numbers the Piscattaways and their allies became more and more accessible to the recurring attacks of the Northern Indians. In 1680 it was reported that the Piscattaways, Mattawomans and Chopticos combined were no match for the "Senecas" (Five Nations) and the Susquehannocks, who

could muster one thousand men to besiege them (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 287). In the following year almost the whole of the Mattawoman nation were said to have been surprised and massacred by "fforeigne Indians" (*ibid.*, pp. 329, 330). About this time the Northern Indians boasted that they had "brought the Piscattaway heads to be as small as a finger, they will now see if they can make an end of them" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 3-5). The Northern Indians took prisoners of the Piscattaways whenever they were able to do so and usually put these captives to death, but the lives of the prisoners taken at the siege of the Piscattaway fort in Zachia Swamp in the summer of 1681, men, women and children to the number of seventeen, were spared, in order that these captives might be adopted into the tribe (*ibid.*, pp. 12, 98, 99; Vol. XV, p. 375). Lastly, or so it might appear, Maryland was not always innocent of a practice in vogue in New England: the enslaving and the transportation to Barbadoes of Indian prisoners of war. An unofficial statement to this effect (anno 1676), regarding captives taken in a war with the Wickamiss Indians of the Eastern Shore, will be found in the Archives of the province (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 136. Maryland declared war on the Wickamiss people in 1647. In 1669 they were again deemed to be enemies of the Province. *Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, p. 91; Vol. II, p. 196). In the case of the Piscattaways extinction did not overtake them in Maryland. They absconded from their former abodes in the year 1697, never to return, leaving the remnants of their old allies behind them. Not many years later they were living under the government of Pennsylvania and the land of their ancestors saw them no more.

For our knowledge of the manners and customs of the Piscattaways we must depend largely on Father White's "Briefe Relation" (1634), on the anonymous "Relation of Maryland" (1635) and on several of the "Annual Letters of the Jesuits" (letters of 1638-1642). All of these works have been reprinted in "Narratives of Early Maryland" (*Narratives of Early*

Maryland, Clayton Coleman Hall, editor, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1910). It was within the private means of the Lords Baltimore to have sent to Maryland accredited archaeologists and artists for the purpose of preparing a work on the subject of the native peoples. That they did not do so is certainly a great pity, if it is not a cause for reproach. They profited hugely by the province at the expense of the lives and dignity of the natives to whom they and their followers did irreparable harm.

Very little is to be found in the *Maryland Archives* touching the particular ways and habits of the Piscattaways. There is the well-known passage about their manner of choosing their tayacs or emperors, to which allusion has already been made (This passage is quoted in full in the *Handbook of American Indians*, Vol. I, p. 339). In the year 1679 the Piscattaways, expecting an attack on the part of the Northern Indians, appealed to the English for arms and ammunition, on the ground that they were out of practice in the making of bows and arrows (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 236). On August 19th, 1678, Nicotagsen, then the emperor, with the "speaker" of the Piscattaways and several Choptico Indians presented themselves to the Council on a matter of business. When asked why others had not come to the meeting, they replied that "most of their great men were very busie in gathering together their dead bones &c^a" (*ibid.*, p. 185). This is probably an allusion to a burial custom which is described by Henry Spelman (or Spilman) in his Relation of Virginia, 1609 (*A Relation of Virginia*, by Henry Spelman, the Chiswick Press, London, 1872, p. 41. For a photostatic copy of this rare work I am indebted to the John Carter Brown Library, of Providence, R. I., through the courtesy of the librarian, Mr. Lawrence C. Wroth). According to Spelman, who lived for some time among the Potomacs, the "former allies" and neighbors of the Piscattaways, the bodies of the dead were placed on scaffolds until the flesh rotted away and the bones were easily removed and cleaned. The bones were then buried in the ground under the

former dwellings of the deceased. The Assateagues of the Eastern Shore had a similar custom with regard to the burial of their chiefs. Of them we know, moreover, that the bones of dead chiefs were enclosed in boxes covered with skins. What space remained was filled with roanoke (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 480). These gleanings are the result of a pretty careful review of the *Maryland Archives* and scanty enough they are.

It would seem to me that some mention of the Piscattaway "tayaes" or emperors of the historical period is here in order, although we know little or nothing of the personal characteristics of most of them.

At the time of the founding of Maryland (1634) Wannis was emperor and it was he who received ("welcomed" would scarcely be the word) Leonard Calvert on his first visit to Piscattaway. In one of the "Annual Letters of the Jesuits" (1639) he is referred to as "Uwanno," a name which is no doubt a form of Wannis (*Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 126). In a petition of Captain William Claiborne, dated June 20th, 1634, there is a reference to "Wannis the greate Kinge of Pascatyeon" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 165). The form which the name of the people here assumes is interesting as being, possibly, closer to the true Indian word. It is the form under which the name occurs in the record of 1624, which is quoted above. In these same Claiborne papers, under the same date, we find mention of the "King of Pascatacon" and of "Pascatacon," the place (*ibid.*, pp. 166, 167). At a conference held at Portobacke (Portobacco), on May 15th, 1662, between Governor Calvert and representatives of the Piscattaway nation, who were then without an emperor, the Indians explained that "Wannas their last lawfull kinge" was done to death by Kittamaquund "to the end hee might enjoy the Crowe (crown) by right of theire succession Brother always succeeding to the Brother till they be all dead" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 453, 454). The Indian emperor Wannas died about 1636 (Letter of Leonard Calvert to Lord Baltimore, April 25th, 1638, *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 158, 159). Kittama-

quund's fratricidal act accomplished its object and he succeeded Wannas as emperor. Of this "emperor" we know more than we do of any of the others, earlier or later ("Annual Letters of the Jesuits," *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 124-136). Miss Elizabeth Rigby has written most interestingly of him and of his family in this *Magazine* (Vol. XXIX, p. 212 et seq.) and to rehearse the facts would be quite superfluous. Leonard Calvert calls him "my brother Porttobacco," for what reason we do not know (*Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 158), while in the Jesuit letter of 1639 he is referred to as "Chitomachon" (*ibid.*, p. 131). This last may represent an effort to come closer to the real Indian pronunciation of his name. Kittamaquund, styled "the great Tayac," died in the year 1641 (Jesuit letter of 1642, *ibid.*, p. 136). It was he who delegated to the English the right to choose the Piscattaway emperors (*Mayland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 15). After the death of Kittamaquund this right was exercised and Wahocasso (Weghucasso) was chosen emperor (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 402, 403, 453, 454). He belonged to one of two families living at Piscattaway, out of which the emperors were selected. The other family was the family of Wannis (*ibid.*, pp. 481, 483). On February 23rd, 1658/9, he was reported to be "dead or ready to die"; whereupon it was resolved by the Governor and Council "that wee should Endeavour the making of a new Emperour in case he dye" (*ibid.*, p. 360). The emperor died and on December 20th, 1660, the "great men" of some of the subsidiary tribes, together with the brother of the new Emperor of Piscattaway, appeared before Governor Philip Calvert and tendered a present from Uttaopingasenem, "present Emperor" (*ibid.*, pp. 402, 403).

The Governor was probably taken by surprise or at least displeased if he already knew about this affair, as he undoubtedly had expected to have a hand in it. He inquired how Uttaopingassenem came to be emperor, "whether by Succession or Election." The Indians' answer is the well-known passage concerning their manner of electing their kings, to which allu-

sions have already been made in this article. Uttaapoingassenem enjoyed his new powers but a short time and on May 15th, 1662, he was formally reported dead by delegates of the Piscattaway nation, who held a meeting on that date with Governor Charles Calvert at Portobacke (Portobacco) (*ibid.*, pp. 453, 454). The Governor, through an interpreter, made known to these Indians that he was come to Portobacke "to appoint them a King or Emperour" and desired to know if they were ready to join with him "in that affaire," after which purely formal exchanges the Indians gave a detailed account of their emperors since Wannas and ended by requesting that Wannasapapin, the son of Wannas, might be selected to succeed Uttaapoingassenem. The Governor acquiesced in this proposal and the Indian delegates promised to notify him as soon as they had prepared a house and "other necessaries" for the new emperor, in order that he might place Wannasapapin "in possession of the Empire over them." They were thereupon instructed to "prepare all things" for the reception of Wannasapapin and to notify the Governor immediately afterwards, so that he might appoint a time "to place him in the possession of the Governm^t." It may here be noted that there was nothing in the shape of a "royal" residence at Piscattaway. The emperors lived in Indian cabins, which were probably somewhat larger and better appointed than those of the commonality of the people. When an emperor died, his remains, or at least his bones were, in all probability, buried beneath his house, after which it was allowed to fall in ruins. Notice that all was in readiness for the formalities incident to the chosing of the new emperor was duly communicated to the Governor, who arrived by appointment at Piscattaway May 30th, 1662, accompanied by the Hon. Henry Sewell and Jerome White, Esq. The following day came the kings and "great men" of "all the Neighbouring Townes," who sat in council with the great men of Piscattaway concerning the coming election. The election took place on June 1st, when the Indians presented Nattowasso, aged about eleven years, and desired the Governor to confirm their choice of him as emperor. They stated that he was the son

of Wahocasso, the late emperor, who belonged to one of the two families from which their emperors were regularly selected. They proposed to marry him to a daughter of the family of Wannys, "now lyving att Pascatoway," who was of about the same age, "whenas they shall attaine to mature years." The Governor demurred about this marriage, alleging "there being time enough before eyther of them bee of mature age to discusse that Business." As this expression of opinion seems rather unnecessary, it may be that his idea was simply not to let the Indians have their own way in every respect. The Governor, no doubt with good reason drawn from past events, warned the Indians against doing any harm to Nattowasso "uppon any pretence, eyther by poysoning of him or by other indirect wayes." What had become of Wannasapapin we are not told, but it seems not impossible that his disappearance was involved in dark mystery. After Governor Calvert had confirmed the election of Nattowasso, whose name was thereupon changed to Wahocasso, "some few Indian ceremonies passed," upon which the English departed from Piscattaway.

On April 20th, 1666, a new treaty of peace between Lord Baltimore and the Piscattaway Indians was drawn up (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 25). Some eleven subject peoples are mentioned as included in this compact. The Indians on this occasion reported to the Governor the recent death of the youth, "Wahocasso the second," the former Nattowasso, their emperor. They acknowledged again the right of the Lord Proprietary to appoint emperors to govern them. It was mentioned in the treaty that the Governor was to go to Piscattaway to appoint a new emperor, on which occasion the "peace here concluded" was to be signed by those "great men" who were absent from the making of the treaty, under pain of being declared public enemies. This Indian treaty was promptly ratified by the Assembly (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 131). That the new emperor was duly appointed or invested with his rank at Piscattaway by Governor Calvert is possible, although failure to find any record of this event casts a doubt on the presumption

that it actually occurred. The treaty of April 20th, 1666, is written into the proceedings of the Council of May 22nd, 1680 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 289-291). The treaty is signed by seven chiefs, including Monattabone, who signed for Piscattaway and "Sacayo." These signatures are ostensibly those of the "great men" who were present at the making of the treaty. There is nothing to show that the absentee chiefs or the emperor, who was later elected, ever affixed their marks to this treaty. While the name of the emperor who succeeded Nattowasso is not known to a certainty, there is not much doubt that he was Nicotaghsen. Such was the name of the Piscattaway emperor, who was living in 1678 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 185). A later record, of May 17th, 1680, seems to mean that the Indian who was then emperor, had, in that capacity, participated in the making of the treaty of peace of the year 1666, afterwards ratified July 20th, 1670 (*ibid.*, p. 284). As a matter of fact the Piscattaways had no emperor when the treaty of 1666 was made; but it may have been understood that Nicotaghsen, being elected to that office as Nattowasso's successor, became in that way a party to that treaty, although it is by no means certain that he ever signed it. On July 20th, 1670, the "speaker" and other great men of Piscattaway presented to Philip and William Calvert a petition desiring the renewal of the treaty of 1666 and, on being informed that these gentlemen wished to make an appointment with the emperor for the last day of October following, replied that the emperor "was at the Sasquehannoughs" (a rather extraordinary piece of news) and that they could not make any engagements for him (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 65). On March 19th, 1679/80, the emperor was reported to be at the Piscattaway fort "soe sick that he could not come" to a conference with the English (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 236); but he seems to have survived his ailment. In a letter of William Chandler, addressed to Lord Baltimore and dated May 2nd, 1682, there is a reference to the "Young Emperor" of Piscattaway, who was then with his Indians at Zachia fort (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, p. 112).

These words are rather suggestive of the thought that Nicotaghsen had died some time between that date and May 17th, 1680, the last date on which we can identify him as mentioned, although he is not then named. It is quite possible that the "young emperor" was that Ocotomaquath or Othotomaquah, who led the Piscattaways out of Maryland and into the wilds of Virginia in 1697. As emperor of Piscattaway he signed a treaty with Governor Lionel Copley May 14th, 1692 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIII, pp. 268, 270). On July 7th, 1696, he was formally commissioned commander of all of the Indians living on the Western Shore (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIX, p. 457). The last emperor of the Piscattaways who lived and ruled in the old historical home of that people, was a man whom many unfavorable contacts with our English antecedents had endowed with a burden of suspicion of their motives. These suspicions were on the whole doubtless salutary, and while some of his people wanted to return to their old haunts and a few did so, their removal, which he brought about, was probably in the end much for the good of the greater number. In the fastnesses, in which they found a refuge, they regained the freedom which our people had taken away from them. Of this man, who, so far as Maryland history is concerned, may properly be regarded as the last chief of the Piscattaways, we know some things to his credit: Philip Haskins and William Dent, who visited him at his fort on Conoy (now Heater's) Island in Potomac River, reported that "he speaks in English as well as in the Indian tongue and exhibits considerable dignity and intelligence" (*Virginia State Papers*, 1652-1781, p. 70).

PART Two: *Piscattaway, the Place.*

The answer to the question as to where, precisely, was the principal home and seat of the Piscattaway Indians, the dominant Indian people of Southern Maryland in historical times, has not been known for a matter of, perhaps, close to two hundred years. It is all very well to say, as most persons interested in Maryland history will say, that it was somewhere in the

neighborhood of Piscattaway Creek. That creek has a length of three miles from its mouth to the narrow gut where Piscattaway Run comes in. For archaeological and antiquarian purposes the description, "somewhere on Piscattaway Creek," is useless.

The term, "Piscattaway," is used sometimes to mean the region round about Piscattaway Creek and the neighboring banks of Potomac River. In the Jesuit letter of 1639 there is a reference to "Kittamaquund, the metropolis of Pascatoa," where the "palace" of the emperor or tayac of Piscattaway was then situated ("Annual Letters of the Jesuits," *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 124). This place, the writer of the letter tells us, was distant one hundred and twenty miles from the mission house at Matapania. Further on in the same letter we are informed that the ceremonies incident to the baptism of the tayac (Kittamaquund) would shortly be held at Kittamaquund, and would be attended by the Governor of the province and by "other distinguished men of the colony" (*ibid.*, p. 129).

The Indian reservation, which was laid out August 25th, 1669, for the benefit of the Piscattaway Indians and their confederates (see Appendix), took in the land between Piscattaway Creek, Potomac River and Mattawoman Creek. It ran up Piscattaway Run to a place not yet ascertained, where it was connected by a line running north and south with a point on Mattawoman Creek, where the Indian path from Piscattaway to Zachia crossed that creek. This reservation undoubtedly took in all of the settlements of the Piscattaway Indians which existed at that time.

The place, "Pascataway," is indicated on that early map of Maryland (1625), the work of T. Cecill, which accompanies the anonymous "Relation of Maryland," a reproduction of which is published in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, at page one. This, so far as I am aware, is the first appearance of the name on any map.

A careful study of old records of various descriptions reveal but two principal seats of the Piscattaways existing during the historical period: (1) a town sometimes known as Accokeek (or

Aquakeeke), which was located on Potomac River below the mouth of Piscattaway Creek; (2) the Indian fort, which stood on the top of a high hill situated near and on the south side of Piscattaway Creek in the immediate neighborhood of the site of Old Farmington Landing. It was, as we shall presently see, the scene of at least one historical event of great picturesqueness, and probably of others equally colorful and interesting. I am willing to hazard the guess that this was that Kittamaquund, where the baptism of the Indian emperor took place in 1639. The site of the old Indian fort on the hilltop near Farmington Landing, though forgotten for two centuries, is one of the oldest and most truly historical sites in the State of Maryland.

(1) Aquakeeke Indian Town.

In the Archives of Maryland we find a reference (1651) to Piscattaway River (the Potomac), "which runneth by Piscattaway" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. I, p. 349.). On September 11th, 1653, there was surveyed for Giles Brent, Jr., a tract of land containing eight hundred acres and described as situated "on the south side of Potomac River opposite against the Indian town of Pascattaway" (*Virginia Land Patents*, Liber III, folio 210). This patent was renewed to Giles Brent on November 3rd, 1662, and the above description is then repeated (*Virginia Land Patents*, Liber IV, folio 417). In his *Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Mr. Fairfax Harrison, the author, mentions a certain land title set up in the year 1653, which is described as "opposite the Indian town of Pascataway," and which some years later is referred to as "opposite the Anacostan Indian town called Aquakick" (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. I, p. 57). The only patent to which this could possibly have reference is the Brent patent of 1653. The explanation of the fact that Aquakick (Accokeek) is referred to as an Anacostan town (Mr. Harrison does not name the record or give us its date) is that the Anacostan Indians, who formerly lived on the Eastern Branch of Potomac, had been in-

corporated with the Piscattaways, with whom they had not previously been on friendly terms, and were allowed to settle on the reservation laid out in the year 1669. Apparently they must have chosen Accokeek as their place of residence. There is no mention of Anacostans in the Spencer and Washington grant of March 1st, 1674, the later "Mount Vernon" (see Appendix), which is described as lying "neere oppositt to Piscatoway." On August 13th, 1662, there was surveyed for Randle Hanson (otherwise known as Randolph Hinson, or Henson) a tract of land, containing five hundred acres, to which no name was then given in the record, but which, it would appear, was called "Hinsonton." This land is described as situated on the east side of Pascattaway River (the Potomac) "near unto an old Indian Town called Aquakeeke" (for full description see Appendix). In a deposition taken March 31st, 1713, Francis Marbury proved the beginning hickory of this land to have stood on a point of Potomac River at or near the mouth of a small creek formerly called "Akakeeth Creek" (see Appendix). This little creek empties into the Potomac on the line which divides Prince George's County from Charles. In this deposition Marbury refers to a time some seventeen or eighteen years before when he went to see Randolph Hynson "in order to buy or purchase his Land in Akakeek." The two tracts of land taken up by Randall (Randolph) Hanson (Hinson, Henson) in the years 1662 and 1663, respectively, lie on Potomac River on both sides of the mouth of Accokeek Creek. The lower of the two tracts, "Charley" (see Appendix), once belonged to the Marshall family and a part of it was incorporated in the Marshall Hall estate. The upper tract, "Hansonton," lies along the river from the mouth of the creek formerly called Accokeek Creek, near the county line, to a boundary on the river not far above Bryant Point, at which place the Manor of Piscattaway or Calvert's Manor (see Appendix) begins. I am of the opinion that the Indian town of Aquakeeke or Accokeek lay above the mouth of the creek of that name and between that creek and the mouth

of Piscattaway Creek. The Brent grant of 1653 apparently lies above Mount Vernon. The former lies "neere oppositt" the Indian town; the latter opposite to it. Mount Vernon lies opposite to the shore between Bryant's Point and Marshall Hall.

Aceokeek or Aquakeeke is seldom mentioned under these names. In a letter of Governor Sir Edmund Andross addressed to Governor Nicholson and dated June 12th, 1697, there is an allusion to the "Aecokick" Indians, meaning, of course, not a separate people, but merely the Indians of the place of that name (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 142). In an interview between the Governor of Maryland and Oeotomaquath, the Piscattaway emperor, which took place at Annapolis, April 8th, 1700, the governor gave the Indian chieftain the choice of Accokick or Pamunkey as a place of residence, if he and his people should return to live in Maryland (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 84). The Indian town of Accokick must not be confused with the village of that name, which lies some three miles back from Potomac River. This village is referred to in an order of Prince George's County court of 1731 or thereabouts, wherein we find a house situated at Accokeek designated as a place of worship (*Prince George's County Court Proceedings*, Vol. 1730-1732, p. 92). The village took its name from the Indian town, as indeed did the creek and the neck thereabouts.

The question of the antiquity of the sites in the neighborhood of Piscattaway Creek as the homes of that particular people who were styled the Piscattaways, is one which, unfortunately, is scarcely likely to be settled by means of historical sources. Some help may be derived from a passage in the *Maryland Archives*, to which reference has previously been made. On the occasion of the election of the youth, Nattowasso, as emperor, on June 1st, 1663, the Piscattaway chiefs informed Governor Calvert that they were accustomed to select their kings out of two families: "in times past there were lyving att Pascattaway Two ffamilies; out of w^{ch} Two ffamilies their Kings were chosen. The one being the ffamily of Wannys; The other the ffamily

of Wahocasso" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 481-483). Indian memory was notoriously short, but it was certainly no shorter than the memories of the oldest inhabitants, of whom there must have been several at least at that time at Piscattaway, who were "in their eighties" or older. It can hardly be doubted that the above quoted words hark back to a time previous to the founding of Maryland. Is it not probable that the earliest time to which they have reference was anterior to the founding of Virginia?

But why, the reader may well ask, if Piscattaway existed in 1608, when Captain John Smith explored Chesapeake Bay and Potomac River, do we not find on his Map of Virginia some place which we can readily identify with that place? The author confesses that this question is too much for him, unless the fact that the map is so crude in detail excuses him. Semmes, in his "Aboriginal Maryland," tentatively identifies Piscattaway with Pamacocock; but in a note gives good authority for the belief that Pamacocock is etymologically the same word as Pamunkey (Semmes, "Aboriginal Maryland, Part 2," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XXIV, p. 203). As this seems to be the case, it appears to me scarcely doubtful that Pamacocock was no other than the Pamunkey Indian town of history, which was situated not far down the river from Accokeek Indian town; and if this is true, then Accokeek or Aquakeeke may be Cinquateck, the next village above Pamacocock on Smith's map (*ibid.*, p. 204). Next above Cinquateck came Moyaons or Moyawance (*ibid.*, p. 205). Semmes locates this tentatively near Broad Creek, and so does a writer in the *Handbook of American Indians* (q. v., under "Moyawance"). Harrison is of the opinion that "Mayaones" was on Piscattaway Creek (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. I, p. 19). It should be clearly noted that Captain John Smith, writing in 1622, distinguishes between the "Pazaticans" and the "Moyaons" (*Smith Works*, Arbor Edition, p. 586).

Before ceasing to deal with this vexed question, we had

better state that if the Piscattaway fort on Piscattaway Creek existed in Captain John Smith's day, there is no likelihood that he discovered it in its hidden recess when he made his famous voyage of the year 1608. On the other hand, if the fort was standing in 1632, it is not improbable that it was "Pascatowie" to which Fleetes refers in his journal.

(2) The Fort on Piscattaway Creek.

It is not unlikely that at all times in their history the more important Indian groups and peoples of Maryland possessed forts, to which they resorted when attacked by enemies in superior numbers, and which in times of peace frequently, if not always, inclosed the residences of their chiefs and others, and within which important ceremonies took place. There exist records of the forts of the Toewoghs, Choptanks, Nanticokes, Mattawomans and Anacostans. In the latter part of the seventeenth century the ruins of two Indian forts were still to be seen near Susquehanna River in Cecil County. One of these ruins was at the mouth of Octorara Creek, the other about three-quarters of a mile away. The Susquehannocks enforted themselves near Piscattaway Creek in 1675; the Northern Indians did the same a few years later at Zachiah.

As to the character of Indian forts there is the well-known account of the fort of the Toewoghs, visited by Captain John Smith in 1608, and later described by him. This fort was probably situated on Sassafras River. Other descriptions of Indian forts within the present confines of Maryland are not lacking. In the year 1740 certain persons were called upon to make depositions on behalf of the Penn family in connection with the Pennsylvania-Maryland boundary dispute which was then still unsettled. The object of having these depositions recorded appears to have been in order to prove, or at least to imply, that the Susquehannock Fort of 1682, by which the line between the two colonies was supposed to run, was situated near

the mouth of Octorara Creek. It is worthy of note that the deponents indulged in no speculations as to what Indians were the builders and occupants of the forts they describe, although one of them, John Hans Steelman, the noted Indian trader, who was born about 1655, being then eighty-five years old, when he deposed, must have had some pretty interesting ideas on the subject. Steelman defined the difference between an Indian fort and an Indian town: An Indian fort was a house or a number of houses surrounded by stakes of wood and a bank of earth. An Indian town consisted of a number of cabins built close to each other without any surrounding stakes or palisades. He testified that some forty or fifty years before he had seen an Indian town on a point about half a mile above the mouth of Octorara Creek. Hard by this place he saw an Indian fort, consisting of a great number of poles or stakes of wood set up and a bank of earth thrown up about the same. John Hendricks, aged seventy-three years, described the difference between an Indian fort and an Indian town in the same words. He declared that some fifty years before he saw the Indian town described by Steelman, which consisted of some forty cabins and stood upon the point of land forming the mouth of Octorara Creek on the north side, within half a mile of the creek and Susquehanna River, which town had stakes of wood and a bank cast up round it and was called by the Indians of the place "meanock," which signified in English a fortification. Elizabeth Murphy, who had formerly lived near this place, described the ruins of the fort, which she remembered having seen upwards of thirty years before. These consisted of "a large bank cast up": "and the tops of the Pallisadoe that had been there appeared to be rotted off and the stumps of them remained in the ground" (*Pennsylvania Archives*, 2nd Series, Vol. XVI, pp. 522 et seq.).

No less than five Piscattaway forts are known to have existed. Of these the one on Piscattaway Creek is the earliest of which we have record. They abandoned it in 1680 and repaired to

Zachia Swamp, where they erected a fort in time to stand a siege at the hands of the Iroquois. When they left Maryland in 1697 and sought refuge in the then unsettled parts of Virginia, they built a fort between two mountain ranges in what is now Fauquier County. Two years later they forsook this place for an island in Potomac River near what is now called Point of Rocks and there they built a fort for their protection. Of their fort near Rock Creek little or nothing is known.

The representatives of the Piscattaways and their allies, who held a meeting with Governor Philip Calvert on December 20th, 1660, reported to the governor that five of their people had lately been killed by the "Cinigos" (Senecas), who "threatened their Forte for being friends to us (the English) and the Sasquehannoughs who are at warre with the said Janedoas or Cini-gos wherfore they (the Piscattaways) desired that for pay they might have foure English men to help them make their Forte" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, p. 403). The sense of this record seems to be this: that a fort already existed at Piscattaway and that the Senecas had tried to take it. The Piscattaways desired the help of the English to make over their fort according to English ideas of fortification. We are reminded that this was actually done for the Susquehannocks at their fort on Susquehanna River. But what was done in the present instance we do not know. The Governor replied that he would consult the Council about this request and return an answer, but the nature of his answer, if he ever made it, I have been unable to ascertain.

The above cited record is the earliest reference to a fort at Piscattaway which I have been able to find. My own opinion is that this fortified site probably existed long before the date of the notice just quoted; that it was the place most often meant by "Piscattaway" and that perhaps it was no other than "Kit-tamaquund" itself. If the Indians had in mind a definite place when they spoke about the two families "lyving att Pascattaway," out of which they chose their emperors (see above), I have little doubt that it was the fort to which they referred. The

fort was without question their safest, if not their most holy retreat, and it certainly was in existence at that time (1663). That the *Maryland Archives* are silent respecting the existence of a fort at Piscattaway before 1660 does not surprise us so much, when we find that those Archives which date between 1660 and 1678 contain no mention of it, so far as my researches have disclosed (see *Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 187, 196, 198 for mention of the fort, 1678). On January 31st, 1678/9, a certain Wassetas, a Piscattaway Indian who was accused of murdering an English woman, was said to be "living in the fort" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 223). This record is interesting as showing that a man of the people made his home in the fort. The same year the Piscattaway fort is described as "three moons journey" from the towns of the Five Nations (*ibid.*, p. 240). On March 19th, 1679/80, the emperor of Piscattaway was reported to be at the fort so ill that he was unable to travel to attend a conference with the Governor (*ibid.*, p. 236). On May 12th, 1680, information came to the government that Seneca and Susquehannock Indians had built a fort for themselves about five hundred yards distant from the Piscattaway fort and within sight of it (*ibid.*, pp. 280-282). The Susquehannocks, then joined with the Five Nations, were burning with a desire to revenge themselves on the Piscattaways on account of the fact that the latter had sided with Maryland when the colony made war on them in 1676. The hostile forces were estimated to number two hundred, but no general assault was made on the Piscattaway fort and in a few days the enemy went away (*ibid.*, p. 283). Captain Randolph Brandt asserted that he found an Englishman at the fort in the emperor's cabin, who was suffering from a wound in the leg. These were dark days for the Piscattaways, who scarcely knew where to turn in their efforts to protect themselves from the assaults of the Northern Indians and their implacable allies, the Susquehannocks. Deeply impressed by the narrow escape which he and his people had just had, the emperor considered the advisability of removing to Mattawoman "from the place of his wonted habitation," i. e.,

the fort (*ibid.*, p. 284). About this time an invitation arrived from the Emperor of Nanticoke, who offered an asylum to the harassed Piscattaways. Lord Baltimore sent them a message signifying his readiness to provide the Piscattaways with sloops and shallopss to transport them across the Bay (*ibid.*, p. 285); but the invitation was not accepted. The King of Mattawoman declared that the Eastern Shore Indians were as much their enemies as the Susquehannocks (*ibid.*, p. 300) and voiced the opinion, which was no doubt well founded, that if they went to the Eastern Shore, the English would take possession of their reservation in Southern Maryland. On May 29th, 1680, Captain Brandt wrote to Lord Baltimore to say that he had been credibly informed by a man who "this day came . . . from Coll Darnalls upper plantation by way of Pascattoway," that "the Indians had deserted their ffort" (*ibid.*, p. 300). The Piscattaways were willing to remove either to Choptico, Mattawoman or Zachiah (*ibid.*, pp. 300, 302, 303), but preferred Choptico. Zachiah, however, was picked out for them and they were notified to repair thence "and there to seate themselves undr such ffortifications as they shall think fitt to Erect for their Safe guard and Defence" (*ibid.*, p. 304). Meanwhile the Piscattaways had sent agents to the Northern Indians, but these were unable to reach their destination and came back, having accomplished nothing in the interest of peace (*ibid.*, p. 287). The removal of the Piscattaways from their old fort to Zachiah Swamp was blamed for the massacre which, it was said, nearly wiped out the Mattawoman people, who were abandoned "upon the ffrontire open to the Enemy" (*ibid.*, pp. 314, 329, 330). On June 28th, 1680, Captain Brandt addressed a letter to Lord Baltimore, in which he communicated the news that the Piscattaways were reported to have "discovered the Enemy," and expressed it as his opinion that "they (the Northern Indians) will be foul of them before their ffort is finished" (*ibid.*, p. 304). Evidently the fort in Zachiah Swamp was then building.

In a letter addressed to Captain Randolph Brandt and dated June 28th, 1680, Lord Baltimore desired the captain to inform

the Piscattaways "that if they leave their old fort it will be but discretion in them to Demolish it and not to suffer it to stand for the Enemy to enter" (*ibid.*, p. 304). Assuming that it was duly transmitted to the Indians, we find no certain evidence, however, that this admonition was ever carried out. In a letter of August 10th, 1681, Captain Brandt, reporting to Lord Baltimore about a visit paid by him with a troop of horse to Zachiah Fort, then besieged by the Northern Indians, stated, among other things, that he "found a greate tract leading towards the old Pascattoway ffort," which presumably were the footprints of some of the enemy who had recently gone that way (*ibid.*, pp. 408, 409). Some later references to "Piscattaway Fort" (May, 1692) may refer either to the old fort or to the one at Zachiah (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIII, pp. 2, 61, 263). It is by no means certain that the Piscattaways did not return to their old fort, repair, rebuild and reoccupy it, before their final departure in the year 1697. In that same year the Piscattaways told Governor Nicholson's agents, who visited them in their retreat in the Virginia mountains, that they were ready to return to Maryland to settle "either at their old ffort nigh Piscattaway of about Rock Creek" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 143-146). It is therefore extremely dubious if these Indians made any effort to accede to the Governor's advice. The old fort doubtless fell into disrepair, its stockade decayed and fell down in places, but of evidence that it was deliberately destroyed there appears to be none. The statement made by Hanna in "The Wilderness Trail," that the Susquehannocks, on their invasion of Maryland in the year 1675, took possession of an abandoned fort of the Piscattaway Indians, which was either on Piscattaway Creek or in Zachiah Swamp, seems to be without any foundation (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 49). The Piscattaways did not abandon their fort on Piscattaway Creek until the spring of the year 1680. They erected their fort in Zachiah Swamp later the same year. The Susquehannock fort, which was assaulted by the combined Maryland and Virginia forces in the year 1675, and where the lamentable murder of the Susque-

hannock chiefs took place, was situated within three miles of the house of Randall Hanson (Randolph Hinson) (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 126; Vol. XVII, p. 151). This is all that we know definitely as to the situation of this historic fort. Almost certainly it was somewhere near Piscattaway Creek. Hanson, as we have seen, owned lands on Potomac River at Accokeke, extending along the river from about the site of Marshall Hall to the vicinity of Bryan's Point, at the time when the Susquehannocks assaulted his house (see *The Washingtons of Virginia*, by Edward Lee and L. J. McClain, I, pp. 189-194) just before the siege of their fort took place (see Appendix, where this question is further discussed). Their fort was unfinished when the forces under Trueman and Washington arrived before it (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 134). This pretty well disposes of the notion that they had occupied an abandoned fort of the Piscattaway Indians. The year after their fort was taken, they erected a new one in Maryland, in 1676, probably somewhere on the Eastern Branch of Potomac River (see *Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 294). The Emperor of Piscattaway and the King of Mattawoman offered to march with the English against this fort (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 216). It was this action which got them into so much "hot water" and was all but fatal to the Mattawomans. It is probable, however, that they had no choice in the matter.

Information which should lead to the exact identification of the site of the historic Piscattaway fort on Piscattaway Creek, was discovered by this author by accident, while examining an old book of land commissions, which is one of the archives of Prince George's County. This book contains the proceedings of two commissions, which were held, respectively, in the years 1718 and 1719, on behalf of Thomas Edelen and George Noble, in connection with their suit against Daniel Dulany, in order to determine the bounds of a tract of land called "Piscattaway Manor" or "Calvert's Manor." Before each of these commissions Francis Marbury gave testimony in two lengthy depositions, of both of which I have made full copies. The information contained in the first of these depositions is covered, in so

far as it is of interest to us in these connections, by the information contained in the second. I have therefore quoted the second deposition in full and omitted the first (see Appendix). It should be remembered that Mr. Marbury's later testimony was accepted by the commissioners as a basis for the final survey of the manor.

Mr. Marbury's second deposition was taken on April 1st, 1719. He testified first as to the location of a bounded tree of Randall Hanson's land at Accokeek, on Potomac River, on which the bounds of Piscattaway Manor depended. Further on he gave testimony concerning the last bounded tree of the manor. This tree, it appears, was also the beginning of the land called "Stone's Delight." It stood, according to Marbury's deposition, "in a branch upon Piscattaway Creek side near a parcell of Pine trees in an Indian field" (see Appendix for description of "Piscattaway Manor," as originally laid out, 1662, wherein this Indian field is called for) "and further this Deponent saith That Mr. Henson (Randall Henson or Hanson) told him when he went to buy the land (i. e., the land at Accokeek), that Calverts land (Calvert or Piscattaway Manor) joined to his and did take in the Indian fort on the top of a high hill near Piscattaway Creeke and that he the said Henson was with Lord Baltimore at the chusing of an Indian Emperour at that fort that was in Calvert's land." There follows considerable testimony which is not here of especial interest, and then we read: "And further this Deponent saith that the High hill w.^{ch} he shewed the Comiss^{rs} near Piscattaway Creek is the hill topp on which the old Indian fort stood where Mr Henson told this Deponent he was with the Lord Baltimore at the chusing of an Indian emperour; which Indian fort said Henson told this Deponent was in Calvert's land, and this Deponent at the place aforesaid told the Comiss^{rs} that the trenches belonging to the said fort were very fresh and visible in his time and memory, and this deponent carrying the Comiss^{rs} a little further shewed them an Ashen Branch or Swamp upon Piscattaway Creek side very near a parcell of Pine trees standing in a piece of Ground

which had been an Indian field, which in this Deponents time and memory had been full of sedge grass and clear of Brushes and trees in which ashen swamp or Branch aforesaid this Deponent Believes the bounded ash the last tree of Calvert's land to have stood altho he never could find it."

Two plats of Piscattaway or Calvert's Manor are filed with the proceedings of the land commissions above mentioned. The later of the two, of which I made a copy, represents the final decision of the commissioners respecting the bounds and limits of the manor. This plat shows the manor as situated on the south side of Piscattaway Creek and as running to the mouth of the creek, being bounded on the north by the creek and on the west by Potomac River. The southern boundary of the manor on the river stands, as we have observed before, not far to the north of Bryan's Point. In this same book of land commissions are the proceedings of a commission held in March, 1719/20, to determine the bounds of the tract of land called "Stone's Delight" (pp. 78, 85, 86). The said tract was found to begin at the last bounded tree of Calvert's or Piscattaway Manor, by the side of Piscattaway Creek "at the mouth of an ashen swamp." With the proceedings of this commission is filed (between pages 91 and 92 of the land commission book) a plat, of which I have a copy, which shows the location of the ancient tracts, "Stone's Delight," "Saint Anthony's," "Saint James'" and "Saint Dorothy's" with reference to each other, to "Calvert's Manner" (*sic*) and to Piscattaway Creek, which last is here represented as a narrow estuary some two hundred feet wide. On this plat is shown the "ashen swamp," where the beginning of "Stone's Delight" and the last boundary of the manor stood. "Stone's Delight" is bounded on the west by the manor and on the north by the creek and on the east by "Saint Anthony's." The last named tract is bounded on the north by the creek and on the east by "Saint James," which last is bounded on the north by Piscattaway Creek. When these two plats, which are drawn to the same scale, are joined together, the deep cove of Piscattaway Creek, which is indicated on the plat

of the manor as lying adjacent to the last boundary to the westward, becomes recognizable as the cove which lies immediately east of Old Farmington Landing. Distances as measured on these plats and on the modern Maryland Geological Survey's topographical map of Prince George's County, agree more or less closely. According to a survey made for the commissioners on April 3rd, 1719 (see Appendix for full description) the third line of the manor runs from three bounded Spanish oaks beside the road leading from Piscattaway (the village) to Portobacco, north twenty-three degrees west to Piscattaway Creek, "which line intersects the said Creeke in an Ashen Pocoson (swamp) in the mouth of a branch called Piney Branch otherwise Pockett's Branch." This line undoubtedly took in the hill on which the old fort stood. The reader is reminded that after Francis Marbury had shown the commissioners the hill top where the fort had stood, he conducted them "a little further" to the "Ashen Swamp." Modern maps show a stream of about a mile and a half in length, which discharges itself into Piscattaway Creek at the upper end of the cove which lies directly east of Old Farmington. This stream today goes by no particular name, but it is hardly to be doubted that it is the Piney Branch of the old record. A line drawn on the map from the mouth of this stream in a direction the reverse of that of the third line of the manor will end at the road leading from Piscattaway village to Portobacco at the proper distance, more or less. This line, with due allowance for small errors and inaccuracies, will skirt the eastern base of a hill which attains a height of one hundred feet. This hill forms the eastern flank of the valley of the stream identified as Piney Branch. The summit of this hill lies somewhat less than three-quarters of a mile from the mouth of this "branch." No other hill-top lies so near to this place. A road runs over this hill, connecting the main road from Accokeek to T. B. with the road from Accokeek to the little village of Piscattaway. This hill, in my opinion, was the site of the old Indian fort.

Francis Marbury obtained his information from Randall

Hanson about the site of the Piscattaway fort either in the year 1695 or in 1696. The reader will observe that the occasion was a meeting he had with Hanson about the purchase of the latter's land "at Acokeke" (see Appendix, wherein Marbury's deposition is quoted in part). Reference has already been made to a deposition of Francis Marbury, taken March 31st, 1713, relative to the boundaries of Piscattaway Manor (see above; see also Appendix), in which the deponent mentions an occasion of seventeen or eighteen years before, when he "went down to Mr Randolph Hynson (Randall Hanson) in order to buy or purchase his land in Akakeek," at which time Hanson gave him some information about the bounds of his own land, on which the bounds of the manor depended.

Our interest now centers in the identification of that historical event, of which, according to his own statement, Randall Hanson was a witness and of which the fort on Piscattaway Creek was the scene: the election of the Indian emperor, at which Lord Baltimore presided. Governor Charles Calvert, afterwards third Lord Baltimore, came to Maryland in 1661 (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XIV, p. 56). He took his final leave of the Province in 1684 (*ibid.*, p. 56; see also *Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIII, p. 5). As we have already noted, he was present at Piscattaway on June 1st, 1663, when the boy Nattowasso was chosen emperor. A few years later Nattowasso, then known as Wahocasso, the Second, died. We have seen how, at the making of a treaty of peace between the Lord Proprietary and the Piscattaways and their allies, on April 20th, 1666, the emperor's death was reported and it was taken for granted that Governor Calvert should go to Piscattaway in order to attend and to ratify the formal selection of a new emperor. Whether or not this election ever took place with Governor Calvert present is extremely dubious. I find no record of it. The Piscattaways, of course, chose an emperor to succeed Nattowasso; but it is quite possible that Governor Calvert, setting little store by the diminishing importance of a privilege which Kittamaquund had conferred on his father, never took the

trouble of making the journey to Piscattaway, in order to go through with the ceremonies incident to the election of the new emperor. It is a question as to what elections of Indian emperors took place at Piscattaway between the date of the above mentioned treaty and the early summer of the year 1680, when the Piscattaways abandoned their old fort on Piscattaway Creek and repaired to Zachiah Swamp. On May 1st, 1680, Lord Baltimore and his Council considered the appeal of the emperor of Piscattaway for leave to desert his fort at Piscattaway and to seek refuge at Mattawoman. His Lordship then commanded "the several Articles of peace with the said Emperour and Nacons under his Command to be read" whereupon the said articles were read and it appeared "by the said Articles made with the said Empero^r in the Assembly held in the year 1666: and afterwards renewed & ratified by his L^sP^{ps}s Deputy Lieutenants 20th July, 1670 (see *Maryland Archives*, Vol. V, p. 65, for the record to which allusion is here made) that in case of Danger his L^sP^{ps}s Governo^r here shall appoint a place to w^{ch} the Indians und^r the said Empero^rs Command shall bring their wives and Children" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 284). The erroneous statement contained in the above record has already been pointed out: The Piscattaway Indians had no emperor, when the treaty of 1666 was made. That fact is made plain in the treaty itself, and it must have been clear to Lord Baltimore and to the Council, when the treaty was read to them. It may be that they knew that the present emperor was Nattowasso's successor, duly elected about 1666 and in that sense a party to the treaty made earlier in that year with his people. If that was the case, his name was Nicotaghse, for, as we have seen above, such was the name of the Indian emperor in 1678. It is quite possible that Nicotaghse was no other than that Monattabone, who, as one of the head men of the Piscattaways affixed his mark to the treaty of 1666 (see above). On the other hand, it may be that we have to deal with a very ambiguous record and that several emperors actually intervened between Nattowasso and Nicotaghse. Be this as it may, I find but one

historical instance of the election of an Indian emperor at Piscattaway at which Governor Charles Calvert, later the third Lord Baltimore, presided: the ceremonial occasion which came to an end on June 1st, 1663. It is my honest opinion that this was the occasion to which Hanson referred in his conversation with Francis Marbury.

We might add that Randall Hanson, as he was generally called (he calls himself Randolph Hynson in his will and it is under this name that Francis Marbury refers to him) was an officer of the militia and a man of some local distinction, who, as we have already noted, acquired landed interests at Piscattaway in 1662. It was no doubt in a military capacity and as an officer of the guard that he attended the Indian emperor's election at the Piscattaway Fort.

On abandoning their fort on Piscattaway Creek, the Piscattaway Indians, as we have already noted, acting according to the instructions of Lord Baltimore, sought refuge in Zachiah Swamp, where they built a new fort, which was under construction about the middle of the year 1680. It seems most probable that the place selected by them as the site of their new fort was an old settlement of their allies, the Zachiah Indians, the place called Zachiah or Sacayo. By order of the Provincial Court, which met on February 9th, 1663/4, the Indians of Sackayo and Portoback were instructed to make pounds, in which they were to pen up the stock of English planters which did damage to their corn fields, the animals so impounded to be redeemed by their owners on payment of a fine (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XLIX, p. 139). By way of parenthesis let us say here that the Maryland Indians originally, or so it would appear, never fenced in their fields. On November 17, 1663, the Queen of Portoback complained to the Council that the depredations caused by the cattle and hogs of the English had compelled her and her people to forsake "their ancient plantacons by the River side" (Potomac), "they not knowing the way and meanes to fence in their Corne feilds as the English doe" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. III, p. 489). At the making of the treaty of 1666 the Piscat-

taways and their allies were enjoined to fence in their fields, excepting the Nanjemaicks, who, it seems, already had fences around theirs (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 290, 291). There were fences about the corn fields at Zachiah in 1681 (*ibid.*, p. 374). The "Sacayo" Indians were among those confederates of the Piscattaway Indians, who signed the treaty with Maryland in 1666 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 289). Now, on May 1st, 1665, there was ordered to be reserved for Lord Baltimore in Charles County two manors of six thousand acres each: the one about the town of Pangaia, the other including the town of "Sackaio" (Kilty's *Landholder's Assistant*, pp. 99, 100). These towns, in my opinion, were unquestionably Indian settlements. Kilty says that these were Indian lands (*ibid.*, p. 100). In a record of 1658 we find mention of a "Pangayo" Indian (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 200). The Pangayo Indians also were parties to the treaty of 1666. The Lord Proprietary's purpose in erecting these lands into manors for his own use was undoubtedly, in part at least, the more easily to protect the Indians in their right to their lands.¹ Zacaya Manor was laid out April 22nd, 1667

¹ Governor Charles Calvert, later Lord Baltimore, appears to have had a house of some sort, probably a small fort where an agent resided, at Zachiah. At a meeting of the Assembly, held May 27th, 1674, there was read an act "for amending the Waies out of Charles County to the Cittie of St. Maries" and it was voted that "one way be made over Sacciaia Swampe & tht. to be by Mr. Allens Mill or within two miles above it"; "& this House doe thinke the Way by his Excellencies house at Sacciaia unnecessary for the present" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. II, p. 369). Now, in the journal of Colonels Coursey and Stevens, Lord Baltimore's agents, who, in August, 1681, were sent to treat with the Northern Indians at Zachiah Fort, we read, that on the 27th of that month, having first tarried over night at the plantation of James Bowling and having sent messengers ahead, they set out for "Zachajah house," which they reached about sunset. Here they got in touch with the Northern Indians. On hearing their demands the Indians promised an answer on the following day, whereupon the commissioners withdrew to the house of Captain William Barton, where they passed the night. The day following they returned to Zachiah House to receive the Indians' answer. Captain Randolph Brandt, who commanded the troop of horse which acted as their guard on this occasion, had spent the night there and reported to them "that there were

(Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber X, folio 488). This record is badly damaged. By a resurvey it was found to contain more than nine thousand acres. Brumbaugh gives a list of the lessees and patentees (several large patented tracts were laid out within this manor) as of 1768 (Brumbaugh's *Maryland Records*, Vol. II, p. 29 et seq.). The manor lies west of Zachiah Swamp, between the swamp and Portobacco. At what places it touches Zachiah Swamp I do not know, and knowledge that an Indian town lay within such a vast tract is of no help in locating it. The "Indian Reserve" or reservation, which was laid out on August 25th, 1669 (see Appendix) for the benefit of the Piscattaways and their allies, between Piscattaway Creek and Mattawoman Creek and bounded on the west by Potomac River, began "at Mattawoman Creek at a marked white oak standing near a path that leadeth over the said creek from Pascattoway unto Zaccaya." A tract of land called "Aix," which was surveyed for Ignatius Wheeler in the year 1687, begins "at a bounded spanish oak standing on the south side of Mattawoman Run on the east side of the path that goeth from Zachiah ffort to Piscattaway near the bounded tree (i. e., the beginning tree) of the Indian Reserve" (see Appendix). In other words, the same path which, in 1669, eleven years before Zachiah Fort was built, led from Piscattaway to Zachiah, in 1688 was described as leading from Piscattaway to the Zachiah Fort. This was probably the "Sakya path that leads to Piscattaway," which is mentioned in the certificate of survey of a tract of land called "Porke Hall" (see Appendix), which was taken up by James Smallwood on March 15th, 1688, "on the north side of the Piney Branch that falls into Mattawoman fresh run." Piney Branch (still so called) rises near Waldorf and empties into Mattawoman Run.

a greate many Gunns shott in the night." In other words he had heard the noise of the battle around Zachiah Fort (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 14, 15). Zachiah House and Zachiah Fort were unquestionably at one and the same place. This is but another reason for assuming that the fort was built at the (Indian) town of Zachiah, since we would identify "his Excellencies house at Saccaria" with Zachiah House. It is also a reason for the belief that the fort stood upon the Manor of Zachiah.

Zachiah Fort, as we shall presently observe, was the scene of historical and very exciting events, and it is important that there should be here recorded everything which we have so far been able to ascertain as to its situation, in order that the exact site may some day be identified. It stood in Zachiah Swamp and on the western side of the fresh run which feeds the swamp. We know this from the fact that there is a reference, dated June 19th, 1681, to "the Pascattaway fort at Zachiah in Charles County" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 354). At that time the "run" of Zachiah Swamp still formed the boundary between Charles and Saint Mary's Counties, according to a proclamation of Governor Fendall, dated May 10th, 1658 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 88). This run has a total length of about nineteen miles, while the swamp, beginning at Wicomico River, extends upwards along the run for over thirteen miles. This is a very considerable distance within which to find that for which we are seeking. But assuming, as I do, that the town which we find referred to as "the Indian Towne Zachajah" adjoined Zachiah Fort, if it did not actually lie within the fort itself, I am in a position to speak much more definitely as to the fort's location:

On May 2nd, 1682, a certain Dennis Husculah, of Saint Mary's County, otherwise called Husculow, deposed in the presence of the Council, that he lived about five miles from the place where John Pryor, a London merchant, kept store "his house (Husculah's) being within four miles of the Indian Towne Zachajah." He declared that he often had occasion "to have conference with the said Indians" of that place and of late had been buying deer skins from them "to supply my greate necessity for Cloatheing." These Indians had informed him that they had been selling their deer skins to the aforesaid Pryor, and "of late he hath seen severall Indians pass by his house with bundles of Deere skinns, who told me that they had sold those Deere skinns to the aforesaid M^rchant." Merchants at that time were forbidden by Act of Assembly from purchasing deer skins of the Indians, because "the Inhabitants . . . are

hereby prevented from buying Deere skins of the s^d Indians the onely hopes of Cloatheing our selves this scarce years of goods." It was further explained that the residence of Pryor, the merchant, and the place where he kept store, when in Maryland, was at Westwood House, the property of Thomas Gerard (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 92, 94). This Westwood House stood on the Manor of Westwood, which was surveyed for Thomas Gerard on May 17th, 1651 (Rent-Roll, Charles County Md., Calvert Papers No. 885½, p. 153). The manor of Westwood, which is marked down on Augustine Herman's map of Virginia and Maryland (1670), lies at the head of Wicomico River and on the northern side of the river a short distance below the mouth of Zachiah Swamp and west of Gilbert Swamp. Westwood House was doubtless adjacent to some dry landing on the river. Today there are few, if any, such landings on the manor land, since the head of the river has become silted up and has turned into marshes. In the year 1683 the Maryland Assembly provided for the establishment of a town and port on Wicomico River "between the mouth of Chaptico Bay and Westwood House" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. VII, p. 460).

Rent-rolls and patent records show that Dennis Huseulow (Huseulah) took up three tracts of land in what was at that time Saint Mary's County: "Saint Ann's," or "St. Ann," "Saint Vincent's" and "Huseulow's Addition." The two first named were surveyed on April 15th and August 21st, 1672, respectively. The last named tract was laid out on August 1st, 1673 (Rent-roll Charles County, Md., Calvert Papers No. 885½, p. 154; Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber XVII, pp. 213, 247). "Saint Vincent's" is described as beginning "at a bounded Pockicory standing by a bounded tree of his (Huseulow's) own land called St. Anne." "Huseulow's Addition" begins "at a bounded white oak standing on the east side of Zachiah Swamp near the Land of Captain Boarman called Georges Rest." The land runs thence north east by north fifty perches "to a bounded ash a bounded Tree of Mr James Bowlings, thence north north east eighty perches to a bounded gumme

of his (Huseulow's) own Land." By this reference to "his own land" it is scarcely doubtful that one of the two above mentioned tracts of land was meant, although no bounded gum tree is called for in the surveys of either one of them. Such discrepancies are very common in these old surveys, however. The next line of "Huseulow's Addition" runs north west and by north "into the swamp" (Zachiah Swamp). "Saint Ann's" was resurveyed for Samuel Turner on June 22nd, 1721 (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patented Certificate No. 1118, Charles County). The resurvey included another original survey called "Bow" and was called "Turner's Forrest." The survey of "Huseulow's Addition" calls for the land of Captain (William) Boarman called "George's Rest." The last named tract, otherwise known as "Saint George's Rest," was surveyed for William Boarman May 22nd, 1662, and was afterwards (1676) included in that very extensive tract called "Boarman's Manor" (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber XIX, folio 271). "Boarman's Manor" extends for a number of miles on both sides of Zachiah Swamp. The manor includes the village of Bryantown and its upper limits are probably not far above that place. Its lower limits have not been ascertained by this author, but this fact is worthy of note: the beginning of the manor, as surveyed in 1676, was on the eastern side of Zachiah Swamp, at the northernmost bounded tree of the land called "Calvert's Hope." On February 19th, 1670, James Bowling took up the land called "Calvert's Hope," "on the east side of a main fresh branch (Zachiah) of Wicocomoco (River) about three miles from the river" (Rent-roll, Charles County, Md., Calvert Papers No. 885½, p. 154). A part of "Calvert's Hope" lies on the road between Centreville (now Dentsville) and Newport (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Abstracts of Deeds, Charles County, Liber C. No. 4, folio 76). These land notes, while they made very tedious reading, are given in the hope that some one of my readers may know the location of "Georges Rest" or of any one of the three tracts of land taken up by Dennis Huseulow.

It is my opinion that the lands of Dennis Husculow lay all together (they are small tracts) on the eastern side of Zachiah Swamp in the neighborhood of Dentsville, in a westerly or south westerly direction from that place between it and Zachiah Swamp. This opinion is based on Husculow's own statement as to the approximate distance between his house and Westwood House as well as on the above given data concerning his lands. The distance between his house and "the Indian Towne Zachiah" (presumably Zachiah Fort) he estimated at "within four miles." If the town and the fort were one and the same, as I believe they were, it is known that the fort was on the western side of Zachiah Swamp" (see above); and if the town (and fort) was farther down the swamp than Huscolow's residence, then it follows that it stood not far from the head of Wicomico River. That such was the case seems to me scarcely possible. It appears to me to be almost certain that the town (and fort) were situated up the swamp with respect to Husculow's house.² Granted that town and fort were at one and the same place, I hazard the opinion that the site of Zachiah Fort lay within the neck formed by Zachiah Swamp and a branch known today as Kerrick Swamp, which discharges into Zachiah Swamp about

² For one thing, Zachiah Fort stood in what was then (1681) a wilderness. Charles County at that time lay wholly west of Zachiah Swamp. Most of its white inhabitants lived along the Potomac and its estuaries and the tide of settlement moved inland year by year. The mouth and the lowest reaches of Zachiah Swamp undoubtedly then lay well inside of the frontier plantations. Now, I find that in a letter addressed to Lord Baltimore and bearing date June 20th, 1681, Colonel William Chandler reported that Captain Randolph Brandt had gone to Zachiah Fort to investigate the situation there as regards the Northern Indians and that he intended to "continue rangeing betweene the said ffort and the ffrontire Plantations of this county (Charles), which seems to be much approved of by the Inhabitants thereof" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 375). On August 10th of the same year Captain Brandt wrote to Lord Baltimore on the subject of a visit recently paid by him to Zachiah Fort (*ibid.*, pp. 408, 409). He tells how, on leaving Zachiah, "Doubting of the Inhabitants of the ffrontire Plantations I repaired to them and am now ready to Defend to my utmost." His letter bears the address: "Charles County, from the ffrontire plantations in the woods." He excuses himself for his "bad writeing" on account of haste "and for wante of a place to write on."

three and a half miles south-east of La Plata. It is my belief that the site of the old fort can not be more than two and a half miles above the junction of the two swamps. Possibly it lay immediately above their junction, where it would have been protected by swamps on two sides. This was such a site as would have appealed strongly to the Indians. The old records tell us that Zachiah Fort was in Zachiah Swamp, but these need not be interpreted too literally. It is more likely that it stood on the borders of the swamp than in it. Certainly the Indian corn fields, which, as we shall shortly observe, came up "very near" to the fort itself, occupied dry ground.

Before leaving the question of the location of Zachiah Fort behind us, we should take notice of some other facts. In the latter part of August, 1681, Colonel Henry Coursey and Colonel William Stevens, who had been deputized to go to and to treat with the Northern Indians, then engaged in besieging Zachiah Fort, set out from Saint Mary's City and proceeded on their way until they came to the house of James Bowling, where they tarried, sending ahead Captain Randolph Brandt with a troop of horse and with Jacob Young, the interpreter, with instructions to proceed to within a mile of the fort, or closer, at their own discretion, and then to endeavor to get in touch with the Indian invaders, so as to inform them that Lord Baltimore's commissioners were "at an English plantation hard by" (i. e., at Bowling's) and to arrange a meeting for them. On the return of Captain Brandt and his men the commissioners set out with them for the fort. They departed from Bowling's about one o'clock of August 28th, but did not arrive at their destination until sun-down of the same day. As they had with them "the tall Sinniquo," who was "very lame," their mounts availed them not at all in the matter of speed, and numerous halts undoubtedly had to be made. The Seneca, whether by preference or necessity, accompanied them on foot. This will explain the seeming paradox, that Bowling's plantation was "hard by" the fort, but that it took mounted

men more than five hours to cover the distance between (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 12-14).³

The erection of their new fort in a place supposedly less accessible to the enemy than their old fort had been, did little to relieve the apprehensions of the Piscattaways, although the expected attack held off for months. On February 19th, 1680/1, it was reported to Lord Baltimore that the Piscattaways "dare not venture out of their ffort to plant corne for their sustenance" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 329). Corn was planted, however, for Captain Brandt, who made an expedition to the fort early in August of the same year, during the siege, espied Seneca Indians lurking in the corn field "very near the ffort" and communicated to his lordship that the enemy "have done great mischief in their corne fields which I viewed" (*ibid.*, pp. 408, 409). The Piscattaways told Brandt that the Senecas numbered six hundred, but the real number must have been far less. A letter of Colonel George Wells, of Baltimore County, addressed to Lord Baltimore and dated May 29th, 1681, contains the suggestion that a good opportunity will soon be offered

³ Captain James Bowling's was the owner of extensive lands on the eastern side of Zachiah Swamp in what was formerly Saint Mary's County. We do not know on which of these lands he lived or exactly where these different lands were situated. "Calvert's Rest" (see above) was one of his tracts. "Bowling's Reserve," surveyed for him in 1668, adjoined Captain William Boarman's land called "George's Rest" (Patents, Liber XI, folio 522), which, as we have seen, adjoined "Husculow's Addition" and was later incorporated in "Boarman's Manor." "Bowling's Reserve" is bounded by "Bowling's Plains" (Patents, Liber XVI, f. 420), surveyed for James Bowling in 1671, by "Charley," surveyed for him in 1670 (*ibid.*, p. 31) and by "Chesam," which was laid out for him in 1673 (Patents, Liber XVII, f. 671). Other lands mentioned in the will of Captain James Bowling are "Miller's Choice" and "Keet's Rest" (Baldwin's *Calendar of Maryland Wills*, Vol. 2, p. 68). These two tracts adjoin each other, but their relation to the other tracts is not known. Nothing is known of the exact situation of James Bowling's lands, except with regard to "Calvert's Rest" (see above). "Bowling's Reserve," "Charley," "Chesam" and "Bowling's Plains" adjoin "Boarman's Manor" and lie not far from the east side of Zachiah Swamp, but their precise situation is unknown to this author. These land notes are here included merely for the sake of future reference and research.

to treat with the Northern Indians "at the Pascattaway fort in Zachiah Swamp, where they are intended within a very short time" (*ibid.*, p. 359). Colonel Wells adds that his information comes to him from certain Delaware Indians, who spoke with the Northern Indians "up Susquehanna way." On June 15th of the same year William Chandler wrote to Lord Baltimore, reporting the presence of Seneca Indians before Zachiah Fort. The Senecas, it appears, had already taken prisoners of the Piscattaways (*ibid.*, p. 359). These Senecas it would seem, had come to Maryland by water; for Captain Brandt, who had a parley with them and had found them sparring for a treaty with the beleaguered Piscattaways, wrote to Lord Baltimore on June 18th to report that they were in considerable numbers, and added that they had told him it was their intention, when they departed, "to go to Piscattaway, where they have left their canoes" (*ibid.*, p. 353). On June 20th, 1681, William Chandler wrote again to Lord Baltimore, this time to report that the Northern Indians had gone from Zachiah Fort, taking with them their Piscattaway prisoners to the number of twelve or thirteen: "their tract hath since been seen by one that was hunting for horses about the Pascattaway fort since they went away and the tract leads towards the Creeke" (*ibid.*, pp. 374, 375).

Temporarily at least the Piscattaways were left in peace and Captain Randolph Brandt, writing to Lord Baltimore on June 30th, 1681, reports that he is lately returned from Zachiah, where he was unable to discover any "fforeigne Indians" (*ibid.*, p. 382). The next and the last serious attack which Zachiah fort had to sustain, was in the latter part of August of that year, although alarms had occurred there earlier in the same month (see above). On the twenty-second of that month two Northern Indians, an Oneida and an Onondaga, presented themselves to the Council with Jacob Young, the interpreter. They announced that they had a message from their people and presented a belt of peake and many dressed skins, according to Indian custom. Their message was to the effect that their troops were then on their way to attack Zachiah Fort and might

be expected to arrive on the twenty-fourth instant. About seventy "Maques" (Mohawks) were "lately downe" (already arrived?). The Indians then on the march would number about three hundred. They wanted to assure the English that they need have no fear of them, as they would not be molested. They desired a message from Lord Baltimore to take to their people "at their returne to their ffort which they intend to build by the Pascattoways" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 3-5). They desired that the Piscattoways be divested of the forty guns which, they said, the English had lent them for hunting (*ibid.*, p. 4), but which would undoubtedly be made use of in the present emergency. The fort of the Northern Indians at Zachiah was apparently erected in two or three days. Lord Baltimore's commissioners, Coursey and Stevens, arrived at Zachiah Fort on August 27th at nightfall, when they proceeded to get in touch with the invaders and to make an appointment for the next day. The Indians failed to keep this appointment and sent word that "they Desired us to come to their ffort to treate." This request or demand was unfavorably received by the commissioners, who "deemed it inconvenient to goe because of the Piscattoway Prisoners in their ffort." Finally the Indians acceded to the wishes of Coursey and Stevens and came to them. Their troops were found to consist of "Manquos" (Mohawks), Oneidas, Onondagas and "Quiongoes" (Cayugas), all of whom were represented at the parley by their "great men." The two commissioners and the Indian "great men" came to no satisfactory agreement. The Indians were implacable in their attitude against the Piscattaways, alleging that their wrath had been whetted already by the loss of one of their number in the siege. On being pressed, they excused themselves from giving a definite answer, until the "Manquos Troop" (Mohawks), who were expected to arrive that night, had been consulted, but held out the promise of an answer by noon of the day following. The commissioners then retired to "Captⁿ Bartons" (William Barton) for the night, leaving behind them Captain Brandt, who the next day reported that

"there were a great many Gunns shott in the night." When nothing was to be seen of the Northern Indians in the morning Jacob Young, the interpreter, with some of the troops, was dispatched to their fort to inquire the reason. He returned with the news that they "had broke up their seige and gone and left behind notice." This last was doubtless some sign which the Indian interpreter well understood. Seventeen Indian prisoners were carried away and the fort of the Northern Indians was found to be empty (*ibid.*, pp. 13-15). On their return to their distant homes in the north, the fleeing Indians committed many depredations on frontier plantations through or near which their path led them, until, in what is now the western part of Baltimore City, their road turned away from the white man's settlements and was engulfed in the wilderness. Day and night was made hideous by Indians "hollowing round" the more remote habitations. On September 1st, two days after the siege at Zachiah came to an end, the house of John Marriott, "on the ridge at the head of Anne Arundell River" (Severn) was attacked by a party of about one hundred Indians, who robbed him and his wife, beat them and turned them out of doors. On September 10th a party of Indians estimated to number one hundred and fifty, pillaged the house and plantation of Edward Brock. The same day "a great party" of Indians forced open and robbed the house of William Jones (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 19, 20, 29, 30). The Piscattaways entertained little hope that the Northern Indians were gone for good and on September 26th it was rumored that they "daily expected them" to return (*ibid.*, p. 27). This menace, however, did not again materialize, and after the signing of the Treaty of Albany (August, 1682) it seems to have been warded off more or less permanently. A separate treaty with the Senecas was made by Colonel Henry Coursey and others, acting on the part of the Province of Maryland, April 16th, 1685, at the house of Colonel George Wells in Baltimore County (now Harford), according to the terms of which the Senecas were never again to molest their old enemies, whom they called "Gonoois" or "Conoois"

(*ibid.*, p. 365). The scene of this historic meeting was a place called Gouldsmith's Hall, which is situated on the bay side in Harford County, immediately above the point called Old Woman's Point, and which is now within the limits of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. The apprehensions of the Piscattaways were, however, slow to subside. On August 24th, 1682, Colonel William Chandler wrote to Lord Baltimore to the effect that the Mattowomans were being harassed by the Senecas and that the former threatened to abandon their fort and to retire to Zachiah Fort; furthermore, that the "Young Empero^r" had sixty or seventy deer skins which he desired to present to his lordship, but feared to leave his fort (Zachiah), lest some harm befall the women and children there, and requested that "some few English" be sent to guard it; to which Lord Baltimore replied that he might tell the King of Mattawoman that he and his Indians had leave to settle at Zachiah and that he would order a standing guard of twenty men to be stationed there at the fort (*ibid.*, pp. 112, 113). In the spring of 1689 Zachiah Fort was still occupied by the Piscattaways and was still the place of residence of the emperor (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. VIII, p. 91). In a record of December, 1690, there is mention of the Indian town of "Zakiah" and of the "Zakiah Indians" (*ibid.*, p. 206). "Zacajah" corn fields are mentioned in a record of 1692 (*ibid.*, p. 349). At what date the town and fort of Zachiah were abandoned by the Piscattaways I have not been able to determine.

As regards the Piscattaway fort on Rock Creek we know only, that in the year 1700 the Piscattaways, then residing on Conoy Island in Potomac River, were instructed to demolish it (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 83). On June 8th, 1697, the Piscattaways gave a promise to commissioners sent to them from Maryland at their fort in Virginia, that they would return to Maryland the following spring and settle "either at their old ffort nigh Piscattaway or about Rock Creek" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 143-146). In October of the same year it was proposed by the Council to send them a message,

that they might "resettle" Piscattaway or Rock Creek, "which they think fit" (*ibid.*, p. 244). It is just possible that this fort on Rock Creek lay near that Indian field, which is mentioned in the certificate of survey of a tract of land called "Girles Portion," which was taken up by Colonel Henry Darnall in September 20th, 1687 (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber XXII, p. 319). The Indian field lay on a "small run," a tributary of a branch of Rock Creek. This extensive tract of nearly two thousand acres is situated at the northern corner of the District of Columbia, between Rock Run and Sligo Branch, in the neighborhood of Sligo and Silver Spring, and above those towns. In the certificate of survey of a tract of land called "Saint Wynoxberghe," which was surveyed for John Woodcocke in 1686 and assigned by him to James Brown April 1st, in the same year, and containing five hundred acres, described as situated "on the west side of the North branch of the Eastern Branch of Potomac above the head of a great savanah," there is mention of "a great Indian field that lyeth in the Forke of the aforesaid Branch" (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber C. No. 3, folio 558). This land now lies in Montgomery County, between Norbeck and Norwood, and not far west of Sandy Springs.⁴ It is barely possible that the Piscattaways had taken possession of the "new fort" of the Susquehannocks, which, as we have seen, that people erected somewhere in Maryland in the year 1676, and which is not to be confused with their fort near Piscattaway Creek, where the tragedy of the assassination of their chiefs took place the year before. There is, perhaps, a clue to the locality in which this "new fort" was situated, to be found in a record of the year 1697, which reads as follows: the Piscattaway Indians declare "that there are five Susquehannocks yet remaining of that nation formerly seated near the Eastern Branch of Potomac and are now among those Indians at the head of the Bay" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 294).

⁴ For information as to the situation of these tracts I am indebted to Mrs. W. Hyde Talbott, of Rockville, Maryland.

The flight of the Piscattaway Indians from Maryland, which took place in the spring of year 1697, and the immediate cause of that very radical performance on the part of this people, are excellently told in Harrison's *Landmarks of Old Prince William* in a chapter entitled "The Migration of the Piscattaways," to which the reader is herewith referred (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. 1, p. 93 et seq.). It was a case of alarm for their personal safety adding itself to a condition of chronic dissatisfaction and vexation. In the proceedings of the Council for August, 1696, we find a recommendation of the Governor "that some way be found out that may occasion the seating a certain Indian Tract of Land Seituated betwixt Pomunkey and Mattawoman extending at least twenty miles upon the River of Potomock & now within the Bounds and limits of Prince Georges County." His Excellency desired "some way be found out to Oblige the Indians to Suffer the seating thereof, wh^{ch} will occasion a greater quantity of Tobacco to be made, as also advance and encourage the aforementioned new county." The Council was enjoined to give serious consideration to this matter "ag^t the Assembly" (before the next meeting of the Assembly) and Colonel John Addison was authorized "to speak to the said Indians" and to report later as to what he had accomplished (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XX, p. 282). In a record of November 3rd, 1725, there is an allusion to the Piscattaways "and other Indians of the Western Shore, who retired back into the Mountains upon some discontent about their Town Lands" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXXV, p. 270). Major William Barton who, acting under a commission from Governor Nicholson, visited the Piscattaways in their mountain fastness, reported to the Assembly that the Emperor gave it as his reason for their flight, that the English were determined to kill them all. The Emperor accused Colonel Addison of having said that he would take their fort (i. e., their fort in Maryland) with thirty men, while Colonel Hollyday, he declared, had said he would take it with forty (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIX, p. 520). He added that "several people bought their lands over

their heads so that they had noe certainty thereof without their leave." Later the same year (July 15th, 1697) the Emperor was alleged to have said, that he was indifferent as to whether he joined with the Senecas in a war, or took the part of Maryland, since the one side drove him from his home and the other robbed him of his corn and goods (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 175).

The new home and fort of the Piscattaway people is described as "beyond the ffirst mountain," or as "betwixt the two first mountaines above the head of oceoquam river lying neare sixty or seaventy miles beyond the Inhabitants" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIX, p. 520; Vol. XXIII, p. 146). The journal of commissioners appointed by Nicholson to seek out and treat with the Piscattaways "at the mountains or elsewhere" is dated June 8th, 1697. The commissioners on their way in Virginia discovered a settlement of refugee Maryland Indians, who were partly Pamunkeys and partly Piscattaways. The King of Mattawoman they found there (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 143-146). Further on they crossed the first mountain and came upon the fort in the plain or valley "between two mountains." They found corn planted on the west side of the fort. They entered into negotiations with the emperor and his chiefs and were met by promises of returning to Maryland the following spring. Various plausible reasons for delay were given. The Indians failed to keep this promise, however, and doubtless never intended to keep it. The emperor was no doubt well aware that his return was not desired for his own good, but in order that the Marylanders might hold him and his people under strict surveillance and allow them few if any liberties. This man, as we have already observed, is credited with intelligence and with a good command of the English language. He was certainly "nobody's fool." He knew very well that extreme poverty confronted his people if they went back to Maryland. The letting in of a flood of English settlers upon their ancient "town lands" had been under serious consideration, and if it was not already under way, it would certainly be taken

up again. The efforts of the Maryland government to get the Indians to come back were in some respects a measure of the advantage which the Indians had acquired in going away. On October 16th, 1697, it was resolved by the Council, that the Governor of Virginia be requested to send commissioners to the Piscattaways at their fort in the mountains of that province, to ascertain how many of them there might be and "whether they had dispersed themselves about a hunting, according to their usuall custom," and to see "whether they have any strange Indians among them" (*ibid.*, p. 243). Several Senecas had already been reported to be living in the neighborhood of the fort (*ibid.*, p. 185). The Council was apprehensive lest "the said Indians living so remote from the Inhabitants may have ffrench Jesuits or Priests or other French men among them."

The Piscattaways appear to have remained at their fort in the mountains for the space of about two years or slightly less, before repairing to Conoy Island. No definite clue as to the location of this fort has come to hand, but it was certainly somewhere in what is now Fauquier County, Virginia. The Occoquan River rises in the Bull Run Mountains in that county. Its head stream is the famous Bull Run. The valley which lies between these mountains and the Blue Ridge, is that of Goose Creek. The fort probably stood somewhere in this valley.

Giles Vandicastle and Burr Harrison, who were deputized by the Governor of Virginia to go as ambassadors to the Piscattaway emperor and his Indians at Conoy Island in the year 1699, reported that they found the Indians' fort on the island not quite finished. It was fifty or sixty yards square and had eighteen cabins in it. There were nine cabins outside. The fort stood at the upper end of the island, which was described as about a mile long "or something better," and about a quarter of a mile wide in the broadest place. The Potomac was not fordable from the Virginia shore to the island, except in very dry seasons. The nearest Virginia (white) inhabitants were distant about seventy miles. The emperor informed the commissioners, that he had made peace with all other Indians, sav-

ing only the "ffrench Indians." The commissioners found no "strange Indians" at the fort, but the emperor told them that "the Genekers (Senecas?) Lives with them when at home" (*Virginia State Papers*, 1652-1781, p. 63). Giles Tillett and David Straughan, who visited Conoy Island the same year, reported that the Piscattaways living there had no canoes! They found Seneca Indians among them (*ibid.*, p. 67). In the early winter of the year 1704 Colonel Smallwood of Maryland made the journey to the island, having with him an Indian interpreter (was the English-speaking Indian emperor then dead?) and sixteen soldiers. On arriving at the island, he was disappointed to learn that the "chiefe of the greate menn" were absent from home, "being gone out a Bear-hunting." We have already noted how Smallwood reported a "great mortality" among the inhabitants of the island, which was supposed to be due to an epidemic of small-pox. The Indians had abandoned the fort on this account and their summer crop of corn was still standing in the field (it was then December) (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXVI, p. 376). Conoy Island had a distinguished visitor in the year 1712 in the person of the Baron de Graffenried (Publications of the North Carolina Historical Society: *Baron Christoph von Graffenried's Account of the Founding of New Bern*, pp. 247, 383, 391). De Graffenried informs us that the Indian village on the island was called Canavest. His journey to Canavest seems to have been made over that old Indian road which, starting on the Potomac at the site of Georgetown, lead inland over the hills and so down to the mouth of the Monocacy, skirting the southern end of Sugar Loaf Mountain. The reader will find this route sketched out in de Graffenried's map of his journey, which is reproduced in the first volume *Landmarks of Old Prince William*. The writer on the subject of the Piscattaways (Conoys) in the *Handbook of American Indians* tells us, that soon after de Graffenried's visit to Canavest, they forsook that place to settle, by invitation of the Iroquois, at Conejohola on the west bank of the Susquehanna River, in what is now York County, Pennsylvania. Their subsequent history,

so far as known, is then briefly sketched (*Handbook of American Indians*, Vol. I, p. 339). It is rather a pity that we do not know the date on which their island in the Potomac was left behind them. This island was surveyed for Arthur Nelson, an ancestor of General Roger Nelson of Revolutionary fame, on February 18th, 1724 (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber 1. L. No. B., folio 132). The survey was given the name of "Nelson's Island," a name which did not adhere to the island. The survey begins "at a bounded ash, standing on the north side of Coyney Island in Potomack River above Monocacy." Some other islands, which lie adjacent to Conoy Island in Potomac River, were taken up by Arthur Nelson, November 10th, 1728, under the name of "Broken Islands" (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber A. M. No. I, folio 47). "Broken Islands" begins "at a bounded elm tree standing on an island in Potomack River a little above the Indian Town Landing." There is little doubt that this landing was the one belonging to Canavest, the town on Conoy Island. Conoy Island is mentioned in a resurvey which was made for John Trammell Feb. 7, 1764, and called "Trammels Conoy Islands" (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber B. C. & G. S. No. 19, folio 553). It is evident that Conoy Island at that time still went by that name which was the Iroquoian name of the Piscattaway people, the name by which they became generally known in the eighteenth century. The island is now called Heater's Island, but at what time it acquired this name I have not been able to learn.

When the Piscattaway Indians passed out of Maryland history the governing class in Maryland (few of this class ever suffered personal injury at the Indians' hands) was relieved of a responsibility and a burden and the common people of the presence of a race utterly alien to them, which they had always regarded as an intolerable nuisance, a danger and a hamper to their ordinary activities and pursuit of wealth. But it must not be forgotten that they were here long before us and that, had it not been for us, their descendants, mixed, perhaps, with

other Indian peoples, would, in all probability, still be living on the Potomac in the neighborhood of Piscattaway. The Susquehannocks, or the Five Nations, or the Powhatan peoples would doubtless have conquered them long since and, after great slaughter, have incorporated them with themselves. In three hundred years they might have made some little advances in the arts and in government, but they would still be "savages" to us. No one questions the fact that it is all for the best that we replaced them; but to give away their lands, their liberties and lives in a royal charter in which no other than the absurd right of "discovery" is invoked seems scarcely fair any longer from a modern point of view. The least that the Maryland historian or antiquarian and their readers can do to repair this wrong is to take some small interest in the Piscattaway people, not in order to idealize them, but in order to discover that which in them was peculiar and worthy of note, to handle their relics respectfully and to see that these last are relegated to places of safe-keeping, and so in a certain sense to keep their memory green.

APPENDIX.

(LAND NOTES)

Upper Marlboro, Maryland, County Court Proceedings, Prince George's County, Old Book of Land Commissions, 1717-1720, p. 35 et seq.: land commission held on behalf of Thomas Edelen and George Noble to perpetuate the bounds of a tract of land, containing three thousand acres, originally surveyed for William Calvert, Esq., and known as "Piscattaway Manor" or as "Calvert Manor." The commissioners met at the house of William Marshall on April 1st, 1719, and heard the deposition of Mr. Francis Marbury, who being sworn, etc., "saith . . . concerning the bounded Hiccorie of Randall Hanson's land standing near the mouth of a small Branch and on the north side of the said Branch there being a small Island near the mouth of the said Branch That about a year or two after his coming up he heard Mr. Henson would sell his land at Acokeke, and Mr. Hutchinson having told him once that if he would buy it he would be his Partner, This Deponent went to Mr. Henson who was willing to sell the land and shewed him his Pattent and this Deponent taking the lines told him he had been at a Bound tree which he was told was his, and told him where it was, Mr. Henson told this Deponent that was the lowermost tree of the tract he took up last there, the first tree being a Hiccorie above the creeke which might be found after running up the River the

first line, and running the second line up the hills would go through the Indian cornfield, and accordingly as Mr. Henson told this Deponent, Mr. Hutchinson, Moses Jones and he went and found the tree agree with his information, and Mr. Hatton and Daniel Connell told him it was the tree for Mr. Hatton had been at a resurvey of the land three years after the taking of it up, and to the best of his remembrance it was there, and Daniel Connell told this Deponent to the best of his remembrance Mr. Henson had shewed it to him, and further this Deponent upon his oath saith that about twenty six years agoe or thereabouts Morris Lloyd and he bought two hundred acres of land lying at the head of Piscattaway Creeke and after he had built a house was threatened and told he was settled upon the Land that James Neale had sold to Mr. Blizzard which making him uneasy they endeavored to find out some persons that knew their bounds and one James Lewis being in Company with Morris Lloyd told said Lloyd he was with Esq. Calvert and Stone when they took up their land at Piscattaway Creek, and that Esqr. Calvert begun his tract upon Mr. Henson, and he markt another tree in a Branch upon the Creeke, and he understood Mr. Neale had taken up a great deale of land after, and that they did not come to the head of the Creeke with Calvert and Stones land. This is what the said Lloyd told this Deponent to the best of his remembrance, upon which the said Lloyd sold his part of the land to Moses Jones and the said Jones being in doubt enquired among the old standers to find any person that knew the bound trees of the other tract of land, and the said Jones told this Deponent that one Richard Jones living in Mattawoman was an old stander and being one time at Piscattaway Creeke with Mr. Allison the said Allison shewed the said Jones his bound treee, and that it stood in a branch upon Piscattaway Creek side near a parcell of Pine trees in an Indian field, and that it was the end of Calvert and his beginning. This Allison was the man that bought the tract of land that was taken up by Stone, and that Moses Jones told this Deponent that this was what Richard Jones told him, and further this Deponent saith That Mr. Henson told him when he went to buy the land, that Calverts land joined to his and did take in the Indian fort on the top of a high hill near Piscattaway Creeke and that he the said Henson was with Lord Baltimore at the chusing of an Indian Emperour at that fort that was in Calvert's land, whereupon Moses Jones and this Deponent agreed with Mr. Hutchinson to give him a Hoggsshead of Tobaccoe for running out all the older tracts of land, which joined one to another and to gett the certificates and if there was any free land 'twas to be in Partnership, so running Calvert's south south east and south east lines they found a small peice of land, and this Deponent bought Hutchinson's and Jones right to it, and running the courses they found the north east line would goe to Piscattaway main runn instead of the Creeke, This Deponent could see no free land within those lines but Major Boreman coming up told Mr. Hutchinson, as the said Hutchinson informed this Deponent that the land which Neale had sold Blizzard did begin at the

fort landing, upon which Hutchinson and Jones took up what land was above the licking Branch and asked this deponent to goe part with him according to agreement This Deponent answered them he could see nothing safe by laying a common warrant in those lines of Calvert But having three hundred acres of land which he had bought and some of it running over Piscattaway Branch into the land of John Hawkins and taking part of his improvements he sold him all his right and title as it cost him to his lease and so gott clear of his Bargain and further this Deponent saith he went to John Stone to gett the lines of the land that was laid out for Stone which he said he Had not But told this Deponent that Stone who took up the Land when he came from the survey of it, said that his land lay on the side on the side (sic) of Piscattaway Creeke, and that it was a fine gravelly creeke where it lay, and at the same time James Neale being Company told this Deponent that he was with his Father when he took uo his land sold to Blizzard and his Father begun at the upper fort landing But he staying in his Boat did not see how farr they went up the Creek But they told him that they took it up to the Head of the Creeke and further this Deponent saith that the High hill wch he shewed the Comiss^rs near Piscattaway Creek is the hill topp on which the old Indian fort stood where Mr Henson told this Deponent he was with the Lord Baltimore at the chusing of an Indian emperour; which Indian fort said Henson told this Deponent was in Calvert's land, and this Deponent at the place aforesaid told the Comiss^rs that the trenches belonging to the said fort were very fresh and visible in his time and memory, and this Deponent carrying the Comiss^rs a little further shewed them an Ashen Branch or Swamp upon Piscattaway Creek side very near a parcell of Pine trees standing in a piece of Ground which had been an Indian field, which in this Deponents time and memory had been full of sedge grass and clear of Brushes and trees in which ashen swamp or Branch aforesaid this Deponent believes the bounded ash the last tree of Calvert's land to have stood altho he never could find it and further this Deponent saith not" (copied by William B. Marye at Upper Marlboro, Md., June, 1935).

Ibid., p. 43 (proceedings of same land commission): "Prince Ge^o Coty April 3^d 1719: Then mett at the house of William Marshall Mess^rs. Patrick Hepburn, Joseph Belt and Ralph Crabb and proceeded to survey and settle the bounds of Piscattaway Mannor in the Manner following. Beginning at a bounded Hiecorr proved before the said Comiss^rs to be the first tree of Henson's land now in the possision (possession) of John Fendall, run two hundred and fifty perches east north east to find and settle the beginning of the said Piscattaway Mannor, and there bounded an ash and putt downe a Locust post in an ashen swamp adjoining to a marsh for the beginning of the said Piscattaway Mannor and from thence running south south east five hundred perches into a plantation now in the possision of Francis Marbury and there putt down a Locust post and planted and bounded a young Locust tree and from thence running south eighty Degrees and one thousand and Twenty perches (within which line the

said Comissrs gave possession to Thomas Edelen, George Noble and others Complts of Two plantations claimed by Luke Gardiner But now rented and posseed by John Athey and the widow Cecill and another Plantation claimed and settled by the said Luke Gardiner having two slaves at work upon it) which ended in the main road that leads from Piscattaway to Portobaccoe, where we caused to be bounded three spanish oaks two of them on the west side of the said road and the other on the east side thereof, Then north twenty three degrees west to Piscattaway Creeke, which line intersects the said Creeke in an ashen Pocoson in the mouth of a branch called the Piney Branch otherwise Pocketts Branch and the Pocoson and mouth of the said Branch being so mirey and impassible that there was no getting to the Creek side to bound a tree wee caused to be bounded a small ash and a large white oak on dry ground at the place where the aforesaid line cutt the said mirey ashen Pocoson and from thence running with Piscattaway Creeke and Potomack River to the first bounded ash and Locust Post of the aforesaid Mannor."

Ibid., between pages 48 and 49: plat of Calvert's or Piscattaway Manor, as laid down under the directions of commissioners, 1719, and as above described.

Ibid., p. 78: land commission on "Stone's Delight," January 7th, 1719. The commissioners instruct the surveyor (Stoddert) to begin for "Stone's Delight" at the last bounded tree of "The Mannor," i.e., Calvert's or Piscattaway Manor. Plat showing "Stone's Delight," "Saint Anthony's," "Saint James's" and "Saint Dorothy's" (between pages 85 and 86): March 4, 1719: James Stoddert, deputy surveyor of Prince George's County. "These are to certifie that by the orders of the Major part of the commissioners for acertaining the bounds of land, I have surveyed for Mr. Notley Rozer all that tract of land called Stones Delight, Beginning att the side of Piscataway Creek at the mouth of an ashen swamp and att the end of the north twenty three degrees west line of Calvert Mannor," etc., etc. (pp. 85, 86).

Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Warrants, Liber X, 1661-1663, folio 271: August 31, 1662: Layd out for Willm Calvert of this Province Esqr a tract of Land on the east side of pascattaway river & the south side of a Creeke in the said River called pascattaway creeke beginning att a marked oake the bound tree of Randall Hanson and running south south east up the hills for the Length of five hundred perches to a marked oake bounding on the south wth a Line drawne south east from the said Oake for the Length of one thousand & twenty perches to a marked oake on the east with a line drawne north east from the end of the former Line to a marked Ash standing in an ashing swampe by the Creeke side near an Indian feild on the north with the said Creeke on the west with the River and the Land of Randall Hanson aforesaid containing and now Layd out for three Thousand acres more or Less (Note: This land, although not named in the certificate of survey, is the land later known as Piscattaway or Calvert's

Manor. In these old land certificates the Potomac is frequently referred to as "Piscattaway River").

R. T. Semmes Papers, Maryland Historical Society: abstract of deed taken from Deed Book R. No. 1, Charles County, folio 134: This indenture, dated January 14th, 1689, from Charles Calvert of Saint Mary's County, gent., son and heir of William Calvert, Esq., deceased, to Charles Edgerton, of Saint Mary's County, merchant, three thousand acres patented to the said William Calvert Feb. 11th, 1662, on the east side of Piscattaway River (Potomac) and on the south side of Piscattaway Creek, "beginning at a marked oak ye bounded tree of Randolph Hanson," etc., less six hundred acres given by said William Calvert to his daughter Elizabeth upon her marriage with James Neale. "which three thousand acres is situated in Charles County and is part of ye land that was reserved for ye Indians in ye year 1668 or thereabouts."

R. T. Semmes Papers: abstract of deed recorded in Deed Book K. No. 1, 1682-1684, Charles County, at page 421 et seq.: this indenture, dated March 11th, 1683, from James Neale, Junior, of Charles County, Md., gent., and Elizabeth his wife, to Giles Blizzard of London, England, all that tract of land called "St. James," situated on the south side of Piscataway Creek and containing seven hundred acres, which was formerly surveyed for Captain James Neale and by deed of gift, dated December 24th, 1681, was conveyed by the said Neale to the aforesaid James Neale, Jr. (Note: this was the land referred to in Francis Marbury's deposition as the land sold by Neale to Blizzard).

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Chancery Proceedings, Liber P. C., 1671-1712, folio 870 et seq.: proceedings of a land commission granted on July 18th, 1712, to John, Thomas, Randolph and James Edgerton, to determine the bounds of Piscattaway Manor. "March ye last, 1713: Being at a bounded Hiccorie standing on a point on Potomack River side over against a small Island in the mouth of a small Creek formerly called Akakeeth creek now knowne by the name of Joos Creek came Mr Francis Malbury (Marbury) aged fifty years or thereabouts and made oath on the holy Evangelist that about seventeen or eighteen years agoe he went downe to Mr Randolph Hynson in order to buy or purchase his Land in Akakeek and telling him that he had found a bounded oake which the said deponent supposed to be his last bounder upon the River Side his answer was noe that that was his Lower bounder of his lower Tract and that the Beginning of his upper Tract was a hickory which according to his Discription of the place this Depont came and found," etc., etc.

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber V, folio 168: August 13th, 1662: Laid out for Randle Hanson of this province planter a parcel of Land on the east side of pascattaway River in Charles County near unto an old Indian Town called Aquakeeke beginning at a marked pokehikary standing by the water side, and running east north east up the River for breadth the Length of Two hundred and fifty perches to a marked oak

standing by the River side, a bounding on the east with a Line drawn south south east from the said oak for the length of Three hundred and twenty perches, to a marked poplar standing in an old Indian feild, on the south with a Line drawn west south west from the end of the former Line for the length of Two hundred and fifty perches, to a bounded oak that Intersects a parallel Line drawn from the first marked pokickary on the west with the said parallel on the north with the ^{s^d river containing and now laid out for five hundred acres more or less.}

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber V, folio 434: "Charley," surveyed May 4th, 1663: Laid out for Randall Hanson of this province a parcell of Land lying on the east side of pascattoway River in Charles County (called Charley) Beginning at a marked pokickary standing by the River side, being the bound tree of his own Land formerly laid out called Hansonton, bounding on the east with the ^{s^d Land for the length of Three hundred and twenty perches to a marked oak standing in the woods, on the south with a Line drawn west south west from the said oak for the length of one hundred and eighty perches to a marked red oak, on the west with a Line drawn north north west from the end of the former Line to a bounded oak standing by the water side on the north with the ^{s^d River, containing and now laid out for Three hundred and sixty acres more or less.}}

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Wills, Liber VI, folio 236: the will of Randolph Hynson, dated September 28th, 1698; probated April 16th, 1699. The testator authorizes his wife, Barbara Hynson, to confirm to John Fendall and to Joshua Marshall the sale of two tracts of land "Lying in Acco. (Accokeek) Creeke in prince Georges County," containing eight hundred and sixty acres. The testator describes himself as of Charles County. He bequeaths to his said wife, Barbara Hynson, "all that plantation and Tract of Land thereunto belonging called St. Johns where I now dwell" for the term of her life and after her decease to go to "my daughter Thompson" and to her son, Thomas Thompson.

The last named tract of land, "St. Johns," he purchased of William Langworth, the patentee, on February 20th, 1679 (R. T. Semmes Papers, Maryland Historical Society. Mr. Semmes gives as his reference: Charles County Deed Book H. No. 1, 1679-1680, folio 299). It is quite evident that he did not own this land at the time when his house was stormed by the Susquehannocks (1675). The Susquehannock fort, it will be remembered, stood within three miles of that house, where the fight lasted for a whole day and several of the Susquehannocks and several of the English defenders were killed. Now, the rendez-vous of the Maryland troops, some two hundred and fifty strong, who were ordered to proceed to the attack on the Susquehannock fort, was first at the head of Chaptico Bay, whence their officers were instructed to lead them to the north side of the mouth of Piscattaway Creek and there to await the arrival of the Virginia forces from across the river, with which they were expected to cooperate in the attack on the fort (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 49). It seems to

me hardly subject to much, if any reasonable doubt, that Randall Hanson was then living upon his lands which lay along Potomac River within a mile and a half of the southern side of the mouth of Piscattaway Creek. If the Susquehannock fort lay to the northward of the creek, as it seems to be implied in the record above referred to, and if the distance between it and Hanson's house was correctly given (it must have been the distance by water), then it is clear that the fort, the scene of the deplorable execution of the Susquehannock chiefs, stood somewhere in the neighborhood of the site of Fort Washington.

Virginia Land Office, Richmond, Va., Patents, Liber VI, folio 614: March 1st, 1674, granted to Col. Nicholas Spencer and Lt. Col. John Washington, five thousand acres, situated in Stafford County in the ffresses of Pottomooke River and neere oppostitt to Piscattaway Indian Towne in Mariland and near the land of Capt. Giles Brent on the north side and near the land of Mr. William Green & Mr. William Dudley & others on the south side being a necke of Land bounded betwixt two Creeks and the Maine River on the east . . . by the said Main River of Pottomooke, on the no:pte by a creeke called by the English Little Hunting Creeke and the maine branch thereof on the so. pte by a Creek named and called by the Indians Epsewassen Creeke and the main branch thereof which creek divides the land and the land of Greene Dudley and others (Note: this was the famous Mount Vernon tract. See *The Washingtons of Virginia*, by Edward Lee and Lulu Johnson McClain [1932], Vol. I, p. 162). Note the fact that the land of Captain Giles Brent lay to the north of and near to this tract, the northern boundary of which was Little Hunting Creek (still so called). Since the Spencer-Washington grant of 1674 (later Mount Vernon) lay nearly opposite to the Piscattaway town and the Brent grant (1653) opposite to it, the town must have been situated not far from Bryant Point and on Potomac River.

Maryland Archives, Vol. V, p. 165: Meeting of the Council held December 15th, 1668. Consideration given to the confirming to the Indians of certain lands which were allotted to them in the treaty made with them in April, 1666. Ordered therefore all persons be forbidden to seat on or to take up any land between the head of Mattawoman Creek and the head of Pascattaway Creek until part of the same be allotted to the said Indians, if they find it to their liking, in which case the Indians are to remove there with their wives and families. List of Indian peoples affected by this resolution (see below).

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber XII, folio 339: to the honble the Lieut Gen^l and Councill August the XXV Mdelxix By virtue of an order of the Honble Governt and Councell I Jerome White Surveyor Gen^l of the province of Maryland have laid out for the Pascattaway Annacostancke Doags, Mikikiwoman, Manusquesend Mattawoman Chingawateg Nanjemaiick Portobacco Lanays ("Sacayo" in the above quoted record of 1668) Pangayo and the Choptico Indians all that tract of land lying between Paskatoway Creek and Mattawoman creek beginning at

Mattawoman Creek at a marked white oak standing near a path that leadeth over the said creek from Pascattoway unto Zaccaya and running from the said oak north untill it meeteth with the main fresh falling into pascattoway creek bounded on the north by the said Creek fresh and creek unto potomack River bounded on the west with the said Potomack River from the said pascattaway Creek unto the above said Mattawoman Creek bounded on the south by the said Mattawoman Creek unto the above mentioned white oak and bounded on the east by the above said north line.

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber N. S. No. 2, folio 691: laid out for Ignatius Wheeler a tract of land called Aix, situated in Charles County, "beginning at a bounded spanish oak standing on the south side of Mattawoman Run on the east side of the path that goeth from Zachian ffort to Piscattaway near the bounded tree of the Indian Reserve, thence bounding on the Reserve north by west two hundred and fifty perches to a bounded hickory, thence east north east forty perches to a spanish oak by an Indian field," etc., etc. Surveyed January 4th, 1687. Patented to William Hutchinson.

Land Office, Annapolis, Maryland, Patents, Liber XXII, folio 433: "Porke Hall," surveyed March 15th, 1688, for James Smallwood, "on the north side of the Piney Branch that falls into Mattawoman fresh run by a Sakya path that leads to Piscattaway" (this path is twice called for).

ADMIRAL VERNON, HIS MARYLANDERS AND HIS MEDALS.*

By LEANDER MCCORMICK-GOODHART.

Edward Vernon was born in Westminster, London, on the 12th of November, 1684. This date, you will remember, was 12 years after the end of England's last great struggle with the Dutch. It was a few years before the Restoration, and it was at the very moment when William Penn and Charles, third Lord Calvert, had reached an impasse in their discussions over the Pennsylvania-Maryland line. Vernon was born, therefore, approximately 50 years after the foundation of Maryland. Ed-

* Address delivered before the Maryland Historical Society April 8, 1935.

ward was the second son of James Vernon, who was Secretary of State under William the Third. The Vernons were of an old family of Cheshire. Edward had one brother and two sisters. The brother was later British Envoy at Copenhagen. Edward entered the Navy very young, as was the custom in those days and still is in the British Navy, at the age of fifteen and a half, on the 10th of May, 1700, and served in it continuously for some 28 years before the events which concern us this evening. His first position was that of volunteer on board the flagship of that great admiral, Sir George Rooke. Vernon's career was varied and full of stirring incident. At one time he was with another famous admiral, Sir Clowdisley Shovell, and was present at the Battle of Malaga. He was also present at the capture of Barcelona in 1705. At the end of 1707 he was for the first time to survey the scenes which were to bring him fame in later years, for in April, 1708, he set sail from England as Captain of H. M. S. *Jersey*, of 50 guns, for the West Indies, there to be in command for the ensuing four years. His only militant action during this period was to assist in the breaking up of a Spanish squadron off Cartagena, in July, 1710. Little did he think, perhaps, that he was destined to be remembered in history by his later attack on that same stronghold. From 1715 for about five years he was engaged in service in the Baltic. In 1729 a Treaty was signed at Seville, putting an end to a disastrous war between England, France and Spain, and from this time on for a decade Vernon gave himself up largely to political activities.

The operations which I shall describe are familiarly known as the War of Jenkins' Ear. This particular incident, though it had happened eight years before, was one of many which led to the beginning of warlike manoeuvres in 1739. You will probably recall the incident. Robert Jenkins was sailing a small brig from Jamaica to the English Channel when, on the 9th of April, 1731, he was boarded and plundered by a Spanish coast-guard vessel. But he also suffered the extreme insult of

having one of his ears cut off. On his arrival in London Jenkins was permitted to tell his story to the King.

But nothing more happened until 1738, when Jenkins was examined before a Committee of the House of Commons, and doubtless his story by that time had been considerably embroidered. It served, however, enormously to inflame the imagination of the public.

At its roots the Treaty of Seville had been unsatisfactory. Its commercial clauses led to a great deal of smuggling on the one hand, and to violent repression on the other. Moreover, England needed foreign trade and the ports of all the vast territory of Spanish America were closed to her ships by Spanish Government decree. England became, to use an urbane expression, more and more "fed up" with the Spaniards. The angry feeling against the Spaniards gave the enemies of Robert Walpole, the Prime Minister of the day, a definite point of attack on the Government. In the course of these debates our hero distinguished himself by his vehement invective. Vernon was all for "having a go" at England's traditional enemies since the Armada. He emphasized in the House of Commons the weakness of the Spanish settlements on what are now the coasts of Venezuela, Columbia, and Panama. The Spanish coast-guard vessels fitted out at Porto Bello, only three or four miles to the North-East of the present entrance to the Panama Canal. Why should not Porto Bello therefore be destroyed? All that was needed was determination on the part of the Government, and in a famous passage Vernon exclaimed in the House: "Let me do it. I will go to Porto Bello with only six ships and capture it." Walpole was not slow to see brilliant possibilities of action against one of his bitter enemies. Why not send Vernon to Porto Bello and thus get rid of him in the House of Commons? Let's meet his bluff!

On the 9th of July, 1739, Vernon was promoted to the rank of Vice Admiral and was appointed to command an expedition to the West Indies against the "dogs of Spain." It should, however, be stated that although Vernon's appointment was due probably to political inspiration, nevertheless he was considered

the best man available for the task and in fact received the recommendations of two distinguished admirals, one the First Lord of the Admiralty, and the other the Admiral of the Fleet.

War was not declared against Spain until October, 1739. But on the 19th of July Vernon had received his instructions which read as follows: "to destroy the Spanish settlements in the West Indies and to distress their shipping by every method whatever." Vernon sailed only four days later, with nine ships, eight being of the line. He parted with four of these on the way, but on arrival in Jamaica was joined by one more. He therefore had under his command exactly the six ships which he had told the House of Commons he needed. On the night of November 20, that is, one month almost to the day after the declaration of war, Vernon and his little squadron arrived off Porto Bello. I may say, incidentally, that Porto Bello still exists as a decayed little village. The next morning the squadron attacked. The entrance to the harbour was narrow and was commanded by castles, but the garrison was unprepared for trouble. Most of the town's 200 guns were dismounted. There was a very small quantity of ammunition, and the garrison was far below even its peace complement. Admiral Vernon was flying his flag in a ship called the *Burford* and in the attack this vessel was fourth in line. The signal was made for the boats to land, which they did, under the very walls of the castle in front of the battery. The sailors rushed through the embrasures and the attack was practically over. On the next day, November 22nd, the other forts and the town of Porto Bello capitulated. All the ships in the harbour, including three coast-guard vessels, were captured, the brass guns were carried off, the iron guns destroyed, and the forts blown up.

Vernon had kept his word! England went mad with joy. Vernon's success was reckoned to be not only a naval, but also a great party victory. Feeling against the Government was running high. The Admiral was not slow to obtain honours at the hands of his countrymen. Both Houses of Parliament voted their thanks; the City of London voted him its Freedom, and

other cities and towns throughout the country sent congratulatory addresses to the King. All over England and Scotland houses and inns were named Porto Bello, and others of the latter are probably called the "Vernon's Head" to this day. But of more particular interest this evening is the fact that this exploit of Vernon's started what can only be called an orgy of medals struck in his honour. A collection which I have made of these medals is here with me tonight.

Even before the capture of Porto Bello Vernon was wondering what ought to be done next. He was in favour of taking Cuba, but realized that the capture of such a large island involved too great an operation. Nevertheless, the people at home thought Cuba could be taken, and it was determined to send him out a large force for this purpose. Meanwhile, the Admiral himself did not remain inactive. He bombarded Cartagena, which, of course, is still a flourishing town, on the 6th of March, 1740, and he captured a few days later the Fort of Chagres on the river of that name in Panama near the modern town of Aspinwall.

And you will excuse me if I digress for a moment in a much lighter vein. On the 21st of August, 1740, with the fleet at Jamaica, occurred an incident which one might be tempted to say was a greater event in the history of the British Navy, even of Great Britain itself, than all of Vernon's victories; for on that day the Admiral issued a prohibition order to the effect that rum was no longer to be served to the ship's companies. This estimable drink, which is probably not unfamiliar to some of you here, was found to be taken in such excess by the crews of the fleet that, to quote the Admiral's words, "it impaired the sailors' health, ruined their morals, and made them slaves to every brutish passion." But Vernon was not so rash or so foolish as to deny rum entirely to his men. Again, in keeping with modern days, he ordered it to be mixed, but only with water, in the proportion of one quart of water to each half pint of rum. This mixture was to be served twice a day. The sailors, though

devoted to their leader, thought this an unfortunate change, and they consequently, as sailors usually do, invented a name for such a comparatively feeble concoction. Their Admiral was accustomed to wear a boat-cloak made of grogram, a coarse fabric of silk, mohair, and wool—very popular in those days. By virtue of his love for this material Vernon's nickname was "grog," and from the man to the drink was as easy a transposition as is the more usual one of a drink to the man. Such is the origin of "grog."

The sacred robe which Vernon wore
Was drenched within the same (i. e., the grog tub;)
And hence his virtues guard our shore,
And grog derives its name.

In October, 1740, almost exactly, therefore, one year after the declaration of war, a fleet of 30 ships of the line and about 90 other vessels sailed from Portsmouth, the great British dock-yard, under a distinguished officer, Rear Admiral Sir Chaloner Ogle. Here I may interject that it was only at the last moment, on account of illness, that *James Wolfe*, the hero of Quebec, then a boy aged 13, did not sail in one of the ships as a volunteer. Ogle's was indeed a mighty force and included no less than 12,000 land troops, the latter at first commanded by Charles, eighth Lord Cathcart. A great storm arose in the Bay of Biscay and the fleet was scattered, but nevertheless Ogle united his forces to those of Admiral Vernon in the Harbour of Port Royal, Jamaica, in the early part of January, 1741. A few days prior to a temporary halt of the fleet at Dominica, the expedition suffered an irreparable loss in the death of Lord Cathcart. The word "irreparable" is more than justified for Cathcart was succeeded by a Brigadier-general by the name of Wentworth, who was enormously endowed with self-conceit, very much lacking in self-confidence and totally unequal to the job. The force now assembled at Port Royal was by far the most powerful armament ever seen in West Indian waters, composed as it was of no less than 115 ships under the supreme command of Edward Vernon, Vice Admiral of the Blue.

Let us now turn to an extremely interesting phase of the preparation for these operations. The Government in London decided for the *first time* in the history of the Colonies in America to invoke their assistance for purposes of war. After all, the war was against Spain and Spain was a formidable rival not only throughout the great South American continent and the West Indies, but even on the main land of what is now the United States, in Florida. It was essential that the American Colonies should help the mother country. This was indeed a *colonial war*, even more marked as such than the many troubles with the Indians and the French, since it involved the Colonies acting in their own protection in a foreign theatre of war. A copy of the declaration of war against Spain was communicated to Samuel Ogle, Governor of Maryland, on October 29, 1739, three weeks before the capture of Porto Bello, by the Duke of Newcastle, one of the principal Secretaries of State.

What relationship may have existed between Admiral Ogle and Governor Ogle, I have been unfortunately unable to ascertain.

This letter was followed by another on the 5th of January, 1740, informing Governor Ogle of the proposed attack upon the Spanish settlements in the West Indies, and notifying him of the King's desire that he should raise as many men as possible in the Province to take part in the expedition. These letters were laid before the Council of the Province of Maryland on April 11, 1740. A proclamation was immediately issued calling in urgent terms upon His Majesty's faithful servants within the Province to enlist for the glorious enterprise before them. The General Assembly was to provide the necessary funds. At a further meeting of the Council on June 30, a letter of instructions was read from the Duke of Newcastle. The force was to be formed into companies of 100 men each and it will interest you to know that the muster was to include two lieutenants and one ensign for each company, with four sergeants, four corporals, and two drummers. Field and staff officers were to be nominated by the Crown, as well as one of the lieutenants of

each company, who would meet the troops at the rendezvous in the West Indies. One sergeant in each company was to be supplied from old soldiers then in New York. The men were to have the same rank and pay as British regulars and they were to be supplied with arms and clothing. Moreover, they would receive their proper share of booty and be returned to their respective homes at the termination of hostilities. Transportation to the West Indies was to be furnished by the Province.

On July 26, and again, on August 12, proclamations were issued ordering all enlisted men to assemble at Annapolis to be instructed and exercised in their military duties. In the end the Province of Maryland voted £5,000 for the expedition and sent three companies. One hopes the muster-roll of those gallant fellows is still in existence.

The Colonial troops eventually came from nine of the colonies: five companies from Massachusetts, two from Rhode Island, two from Connecticut, five from New York, three from New Jersey, eight from Pennsylvania, four each from Virginia and North Carolina, and three from Maryland, in all a total of 36 companies, or about 3,600 men. The Provinces of New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Georgia sent no troops, the latter two probably because their forces were already being employed against the Spaniards around St. Augustine. We do not know why New Hampshire failed to send its quota.

It was ordered that the Colonial troops should be embodied in four regiments under the command of a distinguished Virginian, Sir Alexander Spottswood. Spottswood had served under the great Duke of Marlborough at Blenheim in 1704. From 1710 to 1723 he had been Governor of Virginia. In 1714 Spottswood was the first white man to cross the Blue Ridge, and this exploit is said to have brought him the honour of knighthood. But, for the second time, the forces were to sustain a serious loss. On the 7th of June, 1740, Spottswood died at Annapolis, while waiting for the troops to assemble. He was succeeded in the command by the then Governor of the Commonwealth, Sir William Gooch, and the whole force eventually came to be

known as "Gooch's American Regiment." The Adjutant-general was a Colonel William Blakeney, an Irishman already in his 69th year, who was sent out from England. It is interesting to see who were the officers drawn from the Province of Maryland. Between the latter part of August and early in September, 1740, commissions were issued to the captains of the three Maryland companies. These were Thomas Addison, John Lloyd, and John Milburn. The respective lieutenants commissioned in the Province were Thomas Crabb, Thomas Lynn and John Watkins, and the three ensigns were William Chandler, John Swords, and Andrew McKittrick. Captain Thomas Addison, we are told, was a gentleman residing upon his estate in Maryland. He raised his company at his own expense, and was wounded later at Cartagena. Captain Lloyd also raised *his* company at his own expense and served throughout the operations. The same with Captain Milburn, who, we read, was on duty with the regiment until reduced in numbers. One feels sure that the families of some of these officers must be still in existence, and it would indeed be interesting if this could be confirmed.

Virginia, as I said, raised four companies, and it was in one of these that Captain Lawrence Washington, the half-brother of George Washington and his elder by fourteen years, received his commission on August 6, 1740, 195 years ago. At least one letter of Lawrence Washington's written from Jamaica in 1741 is still in existence. We know the names of the other Virginia officers of the four companies, and amongst these was an ensign of a distinguished old Dominion family who later on enjoyed a very close connection with the Province of Maryland: William Fitzhugh. Ensign Fitzhugh, who was born in 1721 and died in 1798, was 19 years of age at this time. Later on, in 1752, he married as his second wife, Anne, daughter of Peregrine Frisby and widow of John Rousby of Calvert County. Soon after 1752 Fitzhugh removed to Maryland, where he became a member of the Council of the Colony, and later of the Revolutionary Convention of August, 1776.

The process of raising the Virginia contingent was similar to the steps taken in Maryland. The necessary Act was passed by the General Assembly in May, 1740. Justices of the peace were to levy such able-bodied men as did not follow or exercise any lawful calling or employment. Sheriffs and constables were to assist in rounding them up. Any constable allowing a prospective soldier to escape was to be fined 500 pounds of tobacco. The fugitive was to be punished as a deserter. Virginia also granted £5,000 for expenses.

I will not go into the nature of the measures taken in the other colonies, but information as to these exists in their archives, at least so far as New York and Massachusetts are concerned.

The Colonial contingent, when the circumstances are considered, was raised expeditiously. The five New York companies sailed for the Caribbean on September 19, 1740. Early in October the Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts companies assembled at Sandy Hook with a few New Yorkers who had been left behind, and on October 10 they were joined by the New Jersey men. This force, under Colonel Blakeney, whom I have already mentioned, sailed on October 12 directly for Jamaica. The troops from Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia, under Governor Gooch, arrived soon after, sometime before December 8. These were in their turn followed by the four companies which had left Wilmington, North Carolina, on November 5.

The ensuing two months or so were employed in preparations for the attack on Cartagena, armed with 300 guns and garrisoned by 4,000 men under the command of the Spanish Admiral Don Blas de Lezo. It has been said that Vernon made a mistake in not at once attacking Cuba, which most critics agree would have fallen without much difficulty. But Vernon was at first distracted by a French fleet off Hispaniola since England's relations with France were strained, and not until the Frenchmen had left for home waters did he decide on the attack on Cartagena.

The town of Cartagena is situated on the coast of what is now the Republic of Colombia, about 175 miles northeast of the Gulf of Darien, and 300 miles from Panama. The harbour, which is nearly land-locked, is seven miles in length, and affords excellent anchorage. It has two entrances, Boca Grande and Boca Chica. The latter, or "Little Mouth," which is several miles south of the town, appears to have been the only one suited to Vernon's plan of attack. The place is still fortified, although its importance has greatly waned, and the population is now about 10,000.

On the third of March, 1741, the great fleet appeared off the city, but not until the 9th could Vernon and his incompetent soldier ally, Wentworth, decide where to land. This of course gave opportunity to the enemy for the strengthening of the fortifications and obtaining reinforcements. On that day Vernon and Wentworth landed the troops near Boca Chica, and the land batteries were also attacked by the ships. The protective boom was shattered and the passage carried. Vernon, in great exultation, immediately sent home a ship to announce the approaching victory. Its arrival in England was undoubtedly responsible for a further large crop of what may aptly be called "Victory medals," many of which are on exhibition on the table beside me. A few days later, troops were landed at a place called La Quinta, within a mile of Cartagena, at the other end of the spacious harbour. In this operation Colonel Blakeney advanced with the first division of 1,400 men, in addition to 200 Americans under Captain Lawrence Washington who acted as pioneers. The town of Cartagena itself was protected by the formidable fort of San Lazaro. The enemy abandoned Castillo Grande, the fort on the opposite side of the Bay. Had there been proper coordination between the attacks made by the land forces and the fleet, San Lazaro would have been readily taken; but the worst of feeling prevailed between Vernon and Wentworth, and thus there were two commanders at odds with each other, instead of one good one alone, as was so essential to success. The town was bombarded for three days, terrifying

the inhabitants and injuring church steeples and convents. I am told that one of the British cannon balls is still imbedded in a wall of the Cathedral.

The final assault, which was made on April 9, is thus described: "Stung by the reproaches of the Admiral, General Wentworth called a council of his officers, and with their advice he attempted to carry Fort San Lazaro by storm. Twelve hundred men, headed by General Guise, and led by some Spanish deserters or peasants, who were ignorant, or more likely in the pay of the Spanish Governor, whom they pretended to have left, marched boldly up to the front of the fort. But the guides led them to the very strongest part of the fortifications; and, what was worse, when they came to try the scaling-ladders with which they were provided, they found them too short. This "occasioned a fatal delay, and presently the brilliant morning of the tropics broke with its glaring light upon what had been intended for a nocturnal attack. Under these circumstances the wisest thing would have been an instant retreat; but the soldiers had come to take the fort, and with bull-dog resolution they seemed determined to take it at every disadvantage. They stood under a terrible plunging fire, adjusted their ladders, and fixed upon points where they might climb; and they did not yield an inch of ground, though every Spanish cannon and musket told upon them and thinned their ranks. Some of the grenadiers had even attained a footing on the ramparts, when their brave leader, Colonel Grant, was mortally wounded. The grenadiers were swept over the face of the wall, but still the rest sustained the enemy's fire for several hours, and did not retreat till 600, or one-half their original number, lay dead or wounded at the foot of those fatal walls."

And so the main object of the great attack failed. But great damage was done to the Spaniards. Six men-of-war were taken or destroyed as well as seven galleons and 60 smaller craft. Six forts with 196 guns were laid in ruins.

It must fill us with pride that the American contingent distinguished itself. In the first land attack of March 9 the 200

American troops under Captain Washington were mentioned afterwards for their gallantry. We also know that Wentworth, in a note to the Admiral dated April 2, 1741, demanded that 1,500 Americans under the command of Colonel Gooch should be landed to assist him in the main assault on Fort San Lazaro, on April 9, and in this attack Captain Washington further distinguished himself. But by now the wet season had set in and the men were falling very fast from disease as well as from Spanish bullets. Of the 6,600 men who had been landed in all, more than half were either dead or in hospital, dying. On April 17, 1741, the miserable remnant of about 3,000 were re-embarked, and the fleet returned to Port Royal, Jamaica, leaving a few ships to demolish the captured forts. The last tents to be struck were five belonging to the Colonial contingent. The loss of life amongst the ships' crews must also have been great since Vernon wrote from Jamaica to the Duke of Newcastle on May 30th, 1741, that "Without the aid of some Americans we could not get our ships to sea." We also know from a letter written by Wentworth dated April 1, 1743, that Lawrence Washington not only safely returned to Virginia, but also successfully brought back the remnant of his men. But whatever the hardships that Lawrence Washington encountered, he at least came home proud of his chief. He was a loyal soldier and could commit no greater act of devotion than to name his beautiful estate on one of the bluffs of the Potomac River after his beloved commanding officer. It is even impossible to think that Lawrence's love for Vernon had much to do with his obtaining only five years after the affair at Cartagena a midshipman's warrant in the British Navy for his young brother George. And as most of you here will probably realize, there were others who loved old "Grog" Vernon, in spite of his reputedly violent temper, imperiousness, vanity and impatience. At least one Maryland soldier who participated in the campaign, William Hebb, had the same feelings as Lawrence Washington. Down in St. Mary's County, on St. Mary's River, we are fortunate to have that beautiful old house, "Porto Bello," though the companion home,

"Cartagena," also originally owned by Hebb, being in a bad state of repair, alas! was pulled down only last year.

The love of these men for their commanding officer must remind us of the love of many of your Naval Officers and men who served in the Great War under Admiral Sir Lewis Bayly at Queenstown, when the Mother country had again called on the daughter country for assistance in a foreign theatre of war. I should not be surprised if some little cottage in the neighbourhood of Newport or Annapolis is not called Queenstown cottage or Mount Bayly!

I will deal briefly with the remainder of the operations and with Vernon's subsequent life. Toward the end of May, 1741, a large part of the fleet was sent home under Commodore Lestock, whose name will be found on some of the medals which I will show you. Vernon, Ogle and Wentworth decided that their honour could only be retrieved by an attack on Cuba. Santiago was the point of attack decided on, and since the defenses were too strong to allow of the ships proceeding through the narrow entrance into the harbour, as was destined to be the case nearly 160 years later in your own Spanish-American War, they proceeded to what is now the well-known naval base of Guantanamo. Vernon called Guantanamo Cumberland Harbour. The troops were landed, but nothing was accomplished. Vernon wished to advance by land to Santiago, but Wentworth refused. In December, 1741, the forces reembarked for Port Royal. A reinforcement of two thousand soldiers shortly arrived from England and it was then decided to attack Panama. The inefficient Wentworth, who was still in command of the troops, found after investigation that his forces were insufficient, and the expedition, after reaching Porto Bello, returned to Port Royal. Vernon sailed for England in His Majesty's ship *Boyne* on the 19th of October, 1742, reaching the port of Bristol at the beginning of the new year. In his absence the Admiral had been elected Member of Parliament for two different places. He elected to serve for Ipswich in Suffolk, where he had purchased an estate. For

the next two years he was attentive to his duties in Parliament and wrote a large number of political pamphlets. In April, 1745, he was promoted to the rank of Admiral of the White, and to command the ships in the North Sea. This gave him some cause for exercising his judgment, in view of the threatening actions of the Stuart pretender. On the first of December, 1745, he was removed from his command at his own request. A little later on he got into serious trouble with the Admiralty over some anonymous pamphlets which he, in fact, either wrote or inspired, and on April 11, 1746, their Lordships struck his name from the list of flag officers. Nevertheless, the bluff old Admiral continued to take a warm interest in matters relating to the Navy, and frequently spoke in the House of Commons. Edward Vernon died suddenly on his estate on October 30, 1757, just prior to his 73rd anniversary. Vernon married the daughter of a man of Kent and had three sons, all of whom died young. There is an excellent portrait of the Admiral by Gainsborough in the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington.

The medals commemorative of Vernon's exploits have given numismatists a great deal of trouble. At a reasonable estimate there are approximately two hundred and fifty distinct varieties, nearly all of which are represented in this collection. But as distinct from varieties, there are only some forty different types, of which about one dozen predominate. The difficulty in collecting them is largely one of identifying the frequently small differences in the varieties due to careless designing, die defects, etc. This difficulty is enhanced by the fact that the vast majority of the medals which have come down to us are in extremely poor condition. There is no doubt that many of them ultimately found their way into the pockets of the man in the street and circulated as coins or were used as counters. The lettering and features of the officers represented were consequently rubbed and correct identification became difficult. So that it is very important to procure these

medals in as unworn a condition as possible. The joy of collecting the Vernon Series, as it is called, is largely stimulated by the fact that the last word has not been written on the subject. Many distinguished authorities have attempted to make a complete catalogue, but so far, with only partial success. The most recent authority in America is the late Dr. Malcom Storer of Boston, and the most recent one in England, the Marquess of Milford Haven, the distinguished Admiral, whom, if you will remember, was relieved from his command at the beginning of the Great War on account of his German family connections. Neither of these authorities saw actually in the metal many of the varieties which undoubtedly do exist. Yet both had fine collections. I understand that Dr. Storer's is going to the Naval Academy, where it seems extremely proper that it should go. Lord Milford Haven's magnificent collection of naval medals was broken and sold after his death. In England the British Museum has undoubtedly the best collection and one is now in process of formation at the new National Maritime Museum. There are also good collections in one or two South American countries. A good many can be found at the Massachusetts Historical Society and at the American Numismatic Society in New York. Turning now more closely to the medals themselves, the vast majority bear a direct reference either to Porto Bello or Cartagena, and carry a portrait of Vernon. But some refer to Fort Chagres and even Havana. In one or two the names of the forts at Cartagena are inscribed. And other personages shown are Don Blas, the Spanish Admiral, General Wentworth, and Vernon's naval assistants, Admiral Ogle, Commodore Brown, and Commodore Lestock. The medals, be it said, are the reverse of artistic and a great many are most crudely designed. But the wealth of variety and minuteness of detail in the portrayal of the ships and of the towns of Cartagena and Porto Bello is extraordinary. Many medals show a row-boat with Don Blas escaping with two companions. The legends are as interesting as the personalities shown. The greater

proportion of the medals carry the inscription "He took Porto Bello with six ships only," or its variations. Other favourite legends are "The British glory revived by Admiral Vernon," "True British heroes took Cartagena," which they didn't, etc. A very large number bear pictures of the harbor and town of Porto Bello, with the six ships standing towards the entrance. On others there are shown guns and other military trophies and anchors. Don Blas is frequently shown on his knees surrendering his sword to Vernon, but actually he seems to have escaped in the row-boat. The medals were struck in every conceivable variety of metal, though only one exists in gold and that is held by some to be spurious. The silver ones are exceedingly rare. Being meant for the populace they were sold by the thousand in copper, copper gilt, "pinchbeck" metal, an alloy of five parts of copper and one of zinc, bronze, brass, lead, etc. On several we find the names or initials of the designers or other issuers. At least one source of the medals was Dublin. One or two of them were not primarily used as medals but formed the tops of keys or were uniface and placed on the lids of snuff boxes. I will conclude with an amusing sidelight. For years no one could understand why on one of the medals showing all three portraits of Vernon, Ogle and Wentworth, two lion cubs were represented on the ground beside them. It remained for Dr. Storer, whom I have mentioned, to solve the mystery. The *Boston Evening Post* of July 20, 1741, in its London letter states: "On Monday last, the day of rejoicing for the glorious success of Cartagena, two young lions were whelped at the Tower and are named Vernon and Ogle."

REFERENCES.

- "A Recovered Chapter in American History" by Walter Clark, *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, October, 1896, page 753.
"Maryland's Part in the Expedition Against Cartagena" by Clayton C. Hall, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, June, 1907, p. 146.
"The American Regiment in the Cartagena Expedition," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, January, 1922, p. 1.

"Report of the Committee on Historical Documents of the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York on the Part that the Colonies Took in the Expeditions Against the Spanish, 1740-1742, December 19, 1893."

Dictionary of National Biography—Vernon, Edward.

"British Naval Medals" by the Marquess of Milford Haven.

"Admiral Vernon and the Navy" by Douglas Ford.

"Admiral Vernon Medals" by Dr. Malcolm Storer. *Proceedings* Massachusetts Historical Society, April, 1919.

THE DAILY JOURNAL¹ OF ROBERT MILLS.² BALTIMORE, 1816.

Edited by RICHARD XAVIER EVANS, M. A.

- Jan. 1. Through the goodness of my heavenly parent am I
1816 preserved with my dear wife³ & children to witness
the entrance of a new year. May his mercy lead us
safely thro' it, and find us useful, and increasing
in knowledge & understanding. Furnished de-
signs for Exchange & delivered them to the presi-
dent of the trustees, Mr Patterson. Went to hear
Dr Ingles deliver a discourse on the opening of the
new year.
- Jan. 6. Called on Mr Etting to consult upon the plan of
the improvement of Charles & Center Sts.
- Jan. 10. Called on Mr Williams & Col. Buchanan.

¹ Excerpts from original MS in the Library of Congress.

² Robert Mills (1781-1855), best known as the architect of the national Washington Monument, was the first native-born American-educated archi-
tect. In 1816 he was actively engaged in Baltimore upon the execution of
his design for the Baltimore Washington Monument, having won the pre-
mium offered two years before.

³ Eliza Barnwell Smith (1784-1863) married Robert Mills on Oct. 15,
1809. She was the daughter of Gen. John Smith, of Hackwood Park, near
Winchester, Va.

- Jan. 11. Through divine goodness my dear Eliza was safely delivered of a daughter⁴ this morning at 10 min. past 9 o'clock.
- Jan. 12. Attended most of the day to the erection of furnace at Monument Place.
- Jan. 15. Engaged in seeing the operation of furnace. Drawing Richmond Tomb. Call'd to see Mr Peale.⁵
- Jan. 16. Wrote out deed for 50 feet of lot on George St., Ph^a to Wm. Griffith, Esq., valued at 1750\$, being exchange for property bought of him at Burlington & a lot in Ph^a.
- Jan. 17. Engaged in drawing design of a single house 32x53 for Mr J. Williams. Received a letter from Brother.⁶
- Jan. 20. Had an air fire place put up at Mr Bachonne's Academy.
- Jan. 22. Wrote a letter to the Trustees. Made drawing of an Elevation of Exchange. Began drawing plan of Exchange on a large scale.
- Feb. 1. Wrote a letter & enclosed a sketch of design for Exchange with the statement of the cost of the center block.
- Feb. 2. Called to see Mr Peale & consulted about heating his Museum.⁷ Mr Latrobe⁸ (my old preceptor's) design for the Exchange approved.
- Feb. 3. Consulting with Mr Wilson about Baptist Church designs. Commenced the study of designs for the Baptist Church, proposed to be built corner of Sharp & Lombard Sts.
- Feb. 10. Finished design & estimate of Baptist Church.

⁴ Mary Powell (1816-1894).

⁵ Charles Willson Peale, father of Rembrandt Peale.

⁶ Thomas, residing in Philadelphia.

⁷ Situated on Holliday Street, designed by Mills.

⁸ Benjamin Henry Latrobe, under whom Mills studied from 1803-9.

- Sketched in the evening design for Mr Cox, cashier of the Bank of Baltimore.
- Feb. 12. Called on Messrs Wilson to shew them designs for B Church. Met the bldg. committee in the evening to lay plans before them.
- Feb. 14. Called on Mr Lucas & submitted designs for store front. Made an estimate of the cost of the same.
- Feb. 15. Engaged in drawing disposition of the marble in the base of the W. Monument. Called on Mr Wilson who informed me of the adoption of my plan for the B Church.
- Feb. 17. Began an air furnace in my house on St. Paul's lane. Met the building committee of the Baptist Church.
- Feb. 21. Attended to furnace. Mr Tort & myself agreed upon the exchange of property in Charleston.*
- Feb. 22. Received a note from Mr Walsh upon whom I waited in the morning.
- Feb. 23. Examined with Mr Walsh his house on Great York Street. Met the committee of the Baptist Church in the evening.

* "Ground of Exchange of Property between Joshua Tort and myself.
Feby 21st 1816.

Joshua Tort

House & lot in fee in M— Street—valued at \$1000	
2 Houses in Guilford Alley.....	1100
2 do in Potter St.....	1500
1 do in Western precincts.....	350
Part of bldg on St Pauls lane.....	431
	\$4331

Robt Mills

House & lot in fee in Elliot St.....	4031
Charleston, S th Carolina	
Lease for 4 years of house on St Philip St.....	255
Charleston	
Pay ^t of back ground rent in Western pre ^t	45
	\$4331

- Feb. 24. Engaged in taking dimensions and making working drawing of the front of Mr Lucas store.
- Feb. 26. Engaged in attending to the B Church business & my own house. Mr Walker began digging foundation of B Church.
- Feb. 28. Executed papers with Mr Joshua Tort for an exchange of property & had a settlement with him of contract on St Paul's Lane.
- March 1. Rec'd letter from Richmond and concluded to go to that city.
- March 5. Left Baltimore for Richmond. Arrived at Washington, took a hack, and went to Alexandria where I slept.
- March 6. Left Alexandria and arrived at Fredricksburg. Stopped for the night.
- March 7. Left Fredricksburg and arrived at Richmond by early candle light.
- March 8. Visited Col. Ambler's family and took up my residence there. Began sketch of the plan for the Courthouse. Wrote Mrs Mills.
- March 9. Continued drawing of the Courthouse, and met the committee to whom the plan was submitted.
- March 10. Went to hear Bishop Moore.
- March 12. Engaged in designs for the Courthouse. Wrote Mrs Mills. Dined with Mr Nicholas.
- March 13. Engaged in drawing of Courthouse. Met the Committee in the evening & submitted plans. Rec'd a letter from Mrs Mills.
- March 14. Engaged in larger drawing of Courthouse. Dined with Mr Wickham.¹⁰
- March 15. Engaged in design for Courthouse. Dined with Dr Brockenbrough.¹¹

¹⁰ Judge John Wickham, whose residence in Richmond, now the Valentine Museum, was designed by Mills.

¹¹ Dr John Brockenbrough was chairman of the committee in charge of

- March 16. Began a study of a proposed rout of a canal from the Basin to Rockets without locks. Engaged in design for Courthouse. Wrote Mrs Mills.
- March 18. Met the Commissioners of Court H. who approved of plan & met the Town Hall who confirmed it. Finished sketch of a proposed canal from the Basin to Rockets.
- March 19. Began & finished sketches of certain improvements of the Capitol square.
- March 20. Left drawing of the Capitol square with the Governor for consideration.
- March 21. Began a letter to the Commissioners of navigation to Rockets from the basin.
- March 22. Rode out with Col. Ambler to Mitchell's spring. Finished letter to Commissioners & gave it to Col. Ambler with drawing.
- March 23. Left Richmond for Baltimore. Arrived at Fredericksburg. The Commissioners of the Court House agree to give me \$400 for my design.
- March 24. Arrived at Alexandria where I took the steamboat for Georgetown. Arrived there by 8 o'clock.
- March 25. Left Georgetown and arrived in Baltimore & found my dear wife & children in health thank God.
- March 26-29. Engaged chiefly this week in anything the persons engaged in my house. Mr Louis gave me the privilege of using his wall in building over the alley of my house. Borrowed 4000 bricks from the Exchange trustees.
- April 2. The foundation of the Baptist Church begun.
- April 3. Engaged in giving directions in my house & walked out with Mrs Mills to see some hanging paper.
- April 6. Made sketch of alterations of Mr G's house.

the building of the Monumental Church in Richmond, designed by Mills. Mills was also architect of Dr. Brockenbrough's residence in Richmond, now the Confederate Museum.

- April 7. Wrote Mr Davison and Capt. Morris. Requested Capt. M. to send us 3 or 400 wt of bacon.
- April 8. Engaged about house.
- April 9. Engaged in laying out foundation of Church.
- April 22. Engaged in laying out circle of Church.
- April 23. Agreed to purchase the Blacksmith's stock of tools of Mr Smith for 400\$ to be paid for in 2, 3, 4, & 5 months. Engaged in laying out the B Church.
- April 24. Engaged Mr Francis to put up Blacksmith's shop at Monument by the day, commencing today.
- April 27. Mr Francis finished his work of Blacksmith's shop. Paid him 7\$.
- April 30. Laid out the lines of the Washington Monument for the stone cutters.
- May 1. The 1st block of marble was this day laid at the Washington Monument. The Blacksmith's tools move to the Monument.
- May 2. Engaged at Monument, and Baptist Church.
- May 3. Wrote Mr Page ¹² & sent paper to Col. Ambler.
- May 4. Engaged at my house, at monument & church. Mr Moore from Ph^a visited us.
- May 6. Began moving furniture to new house.
- May 11. Moved all the family into new house where I humbly trust the blessings of God will accompany us.
- May 13. Engaged man to white wash old house, also to clean, get in wood, &c.
- May 16. Laid out the corners of the middle pier of the Washington Monument. Statement of monies for the Washington Monument:
- | | |
|------------|------|
| May | 4000 |
| June | 3500 |
| July | 3500 |
| Augt..... | 2500 |

¹² Caster B. Page.

Septr.	2500
Octr.	3000
Novr.	2000
Deer.	4000

	\$25,000

- May 17. Wrote a letter to the W. M. Committee on the decoration.
- May 18. Engaged attending to hanging landscape paper in passage.
- May 19. Wrote Sister Sarah.
- May 21-25. Engaged in making the working drawings of the Washington Monument.
- May 26. Wrote Brother.
- May 30. Wrote Mr Connelly, Mr Read 64 Dock St, and Sister Sarah by mail.
- June 1. Concluded agreement with Messrs Touran & Steuart that they should furnish the interior steps of Monument of marble at the rate of 6\$ a piece.
- June 2. Wrote Mr Marx, McKenzie, Page & Ambler, for Mr Elliott.
- June 4. Got Mrs Ambler's silk. Began cleaning my boots & shoes at one dollar per month.
- June 5. Wrote Mrs Ambler respecting Susan. Sent Mrs Ambler her silk by Mr Elliot. Polly Altee arrived this morning. Drawings in prospect to be made: Washington Monument as altered
1st Baptist Church Baltimore
Court house Richmond
- June 7. Rec'd a letter from Sister Sarah by Mr Parsons.
Wrote Brother Thomas.
- June 8. Wrote Dr Brockenbrough about Monument, tomb, house, & slates for M. Laid out some work at B Church.

- June 13. Engaged at Baptist Church and monument. Examined Mr Cole's house, alterations.
- June 15. Began the air furnace for E. J. Coale, Esq, Mr Stallings bricklayer.
- June 16. Gen'l Smith ¹³ & Mr Davison from Winchester visited us. The Gen'l staid with us.
- June 17. Continued Mr Coale's furnace. Visited Museum, &c with the Gen'l. Dined with Mr Robinson.
- June 18. Visited different parts of the City with the Gen'l. Dined with Messrs McDonald & Rodgers.
- June 19. Rode out with the Gen'l & Mr Holmes to Hampton & returned to dinner in the afternoon. The Gen'l left us with Mr Davison for home.
- June 20. Engaged with Mr Coale's furnace. Called on Mr Georgen (?) about addition to his back building. Engaged Mr Morton as the carpenter.
- June 24. Left Baltimore for Ph^a on the steam boat and arrived at Wilmington by 12 at night. Stormy weather.
- June 25. Left Wilmington and arrived at Ph^a by 11 o'clock. Put up at Brother's. Called at the Washington Hall. Rain. Attended to business.
- June 28. Settled my business with Thos. Ware and rec'd his acknowledgment in my favor for 423\$. Made drawing of vestibule of Washington Hall.
- June 29. Visited Academy and saw Allston's picture of great merit.
- July 1. Went out with Mr Elias Yarnel to the Marine Asylum to consult upon a plan for heating the rooms.
- July 3. Left Ph^a for Baltimore accompanied by Sister & her son on steamboat at 4 o'clock.
- July 4. Arrived in Baltimore at 3. Found all at home well thank God.

¹³ Father-in-law of Mills.

- July 8. Mr Chavelier offers to do the Ionic Columns of the Baptist Church for 25\$ a piece.
- July 10. Mr Stevenson & Stallings began taking down furnace at Col. Buchanan's house. Attended to them. Preparing to begin foundations to Mr Georgen's addition to his house.
- July 11. Messrs S & S finished taking down work. Began building new furnace. Made drawing of school house for Mr E. J. Coale.
- July 12. Mr Stallings continued building furnace. Gave drawing & instructions to Mr Hussey of school house.
- July 13. Mr Stallings & Stevenson at work at furnace. Made plans of furnaces for St Paul's Church and the Asylum for insane persons near Ph^a.
- July 15. Engaged at Col Buchanan's furnace. Brother visited us from Ph^a.
- July 20. Called on Mr Davis to consult about Water company's business.
Mr L. Taylor's Furnace
Dr Alexander's Furnace
Mr James Wilson do
Mechanics Bank do
St Paul's Church do
Gen'l Winders do
Maniac Asylum do
Mr Georgens (?) do
- July 26. Began furnace in back parlor. Made a sketch of the front of W. B. Freeman's office next Mechanic's Bank.
- July 28. Radius of B Church Dome 58 ft. Span clear 76.4.
- July 29. Continued furnace. Mr Williamson called to consult about his machine for separating garlic from the wheat.

- Aug. 1. Continued furnace. Laid out front of Mr Free-
man's office. Examined Dr Alexander's house for
two furnaces.
- Aug. 2. Continued furnace at Mr Taylor's. The water com-
pany elected me their president. Mr Davis re-
signed.
- Aug. 6. Began 2 furnaces for Dr Alexander. Visited with
Mr Davis the works of the Water Company.
- Aug. 7. My duties to the Water Company commence this
day, holding 1500\$ per annum.
- Aug. 8. Continued furnaces. Engaged Messrs B & H to
do the Richmond tomb.
- Aug. 10. Continued furnace. Preparing to take my family
to Virginia.
- Aug. 12. Left Baltimore with my family on a visit to Hack-
wood.¹⁴ Put up for the night at Poplar Spring.
- Aug. 13. Left the Spring, passed thro' Fredricktown and
put up for night at the stone mill, 3 miles this side
of Harper's ferry.
- Aug. 14. Left Stone mill and arrived at Hackwood.
- Aug. 15. Went into Winchester & visited Augustine,¹⁵ &c.
- Aug. 16. Left Hackwood & returned alone to Baltimore.
Put up at Harper's ferry, kept now by Mr Graham.
- Aug. 17. Left the Ferry, and put up at Poplar Spring.
- Aug. 18. Left Spring and arrived at Baltimore at 3 o'clock.
Thank God for his mercies.
- Aug. 19. Made drawings of a monument for Mr Davison.
Sent it to Mr Davison, and wrote Mrs Mills.
- Aug. 20. Made detail drawing for Baptist Church. Began
drawing of the plan of the City of Baltimore.
- Aug. 27. Continued drawing of Plan of Baltimore. Pre-
paring to visit Hackwood.

¹⁴ Hackwood, Smith family seat, near Winchester, Va., erected by John
Smith in 1777, still standing.

¹⁵ Augustine Charles Smith, brother of Eliza.

- Aug. 28. Left Baltimore for Hackwood to visit my family.
Put up at Fredricktown. Visited Mrs Murdock's
family.¹⁶
- Aug. 29. Left Fredricktown and arrived at Hackwood at
dusk. Found my child Jacqueline¹⁷ very unwell.
- Aug. 30. At Hackwood. Rode into Winchester with Mrs
Mills & children to see the Doctor Conrad.
- Aug. 31. Mr & Mrs Murdock left Hackwood for Fredrick-
town. Went into Winchester with my family &
spent the day at Dr Conrad's.
- Sept. 3. My dear Jacquelina very ill with a high fever, but
thru the goodness of God her fever abated during
the night.
- Sept. 6. Left Winchester (for Baltimore) passing thru
Fairfax court house, arrived at Alexandria.
- Sept. 9. Mr Nickel continued building furnace at St Paul's
Church. Engaged with Mr Davis in running the
lines of the lot bought by Dr White of the Water
Company.
- Sept. 12. Engaged in drawings of W. Monument & B Church
& wrote report of Water Company's business &
met the Board & laid it before them.
- Sept. 14. Engaged at furnace & B. C. drawings. Rec'd a
letter from Mrs M. Susan Anderson went to the
Eastern Shore this evening.
- Sept. 18. Attended furnace at Mr Robinson. Wrote Mrs
Mills by Mr Robinson's son. Attended at Gen'l
Smith's to advise on a marble mantle.
- Sept. 24. Engaged with Mr Davis, taking the levels of Holli-
day, Center & Bath Sts, and surveying the line for
the new road to intersect the York turnpike.

¹⁶ Edward J. H. Smith, sister of Eliza, married George W. Murdock.

¹⁷ Jacqueline Mills (1814-1859) married Edward Pendleton, son of Sen.
George Pendleton, of Virginia. President Buchanan delivered the funeral
oration at her death.

- Sept. 26. Accompanied the directors of the W. C. to examine the new road. Mr Williams introduced Mr Capani, sculptor from Italy to me.
- Oct. 1. At Hackwood.
- Oct. 2. Left Hackwood with family for Baltimore in company with Mrs Smith ¹⁸ & Mrs Davison. Put up at H ferry.
- Oct. 8. Engaged in sketching front door & stables for Mr Donaldson & Mr Partridge.
- Oct. 11. Laid out the foundations of the Portico at Col. Buchanan's.
- Oct. 14. Engaged making drawing of Richmond M.
- Oct. 17. Miss Polly Bush, Mrs Hall, & the Miss Holliday dined with us. Wrote a description of Washington Hall & sent it to Mr H. Hall. Wrote Mr Ashbridge.
- Oct. 24. Wrote a letter enclosing 4 drawings of Washington Hall . . . sent by the owner of the Steamboat at Washington.
- Nov. 2. Surveyed the result of new road from N. Boundary Stone of Water Company to the York road. Engaged in the morning at B Church.
- Nov. 4. Made a drawing of survey of the road, attended to different employments. In the evening began setting office to rights.
- Nov. 11. Began design of a house for Mr T. Chase.
- Nov. 12. Visited Penitentiary & Hospital to examine situation for furnace for heating the rooms.
- Nov. 16. Went out with Mr Sterrets to his country seat. Examined it. Went to the steam boat at 5 o'clock to Ph^a.
- Nov. 19. Engaged in various business. Went to concert in

¹⁸ Anna Smith, mother of Eliza, and daughter of Gen. John Bull, of Northumberland County, Pennsylvania.

the evening. Sister had a fine hearty daughter born this evening.

- Nov. 20. Left Ph^a in the steamboat for Baltimore. Arrived at New Castle.
- Nov. 21. Left New Castle and arrived at Baltimore at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 4 o'clock safely thank God.
- Nov. 25. Made sketch of 2 designs for Mr Winchester's front door.
- Nov. 26. Mr McHany began taking down old work at Hospital for furnace.
- Nov. 27. Mr Sterret adopted plan of his country house & placed the business of carrying it into execution to me.
- Dec. 4. Wrote out Report of Water Works for the past month. Made drawing of the design for the Library & private office of Mr Robinson.
For a cow & calf—cash—\$16.
- Dec. 12. Mr Sterret agrees to appropriate \$3500 to building his country house exclusive of lumber bill.
- Dec. 20. Finished drawing of Col Buchanan's house. Also drawing of range of houses for water company.
- Dec. 23. Measured stone work of W. Monument with Col. Mosher.
- Dec. 25. Walk'd out to the Quarries.
- Dec. 28. Engaged in various business. Read a letter, package from Brother with drawings of Baptist Church.

Monies to be collected

Baptist Church.	\$200
Court house Richmond	200
Governor of V. for D. P. Esq.	30
Mr Georgen (?)	150
Col. Buchanan	100
Mr Donaldson	15

J. Winchester	30
Mr S. Sterret	300
Mr Chase	100
Water Works	375
W. Monument	1000
Col. Buchanan's furnace	200
L. Taylor	300
Dr Alexander	320
St Paul's Church	400
A. Robinson	130
Mr McPherson	200
City Mill W. Works	41
Powhattaon Factory	150
McDonald & Ridgley	300
Hospital	30
McDonald	30
<hr/>	
	\$5,201

Query, Heat

In a series of close fire places could not the smoke from the first enter the next fire place & be there consumed, & thus lessen the quantity of fuel to be used, and the smoke of the 2d fire place pass into a 3d, &c, &c. ?

Water

In making Jones Falls navigable as high as Center St., make a lock at its mouth, which will require no digging of the bed, and the advantages gained by this lock are 1st preventing the bed from collecting rubbish, or if it collects mud, it may be cleaned by opening the lock gates & washing it out; 2d giving all the waste water for purposes of machinery, &c, & enabling a dry dock to be established which this waste water would apply; 3d, establishing a street of business along the whole line of this navigable stream.

Rail Roads

A simple cheap & expeditious species of railroad may be formed by laying pieces of timber lengthwise on the road 9x12 at a parallel distance from center to center equal to the distance of carriage wheels, and covering the top surface with a cast iron plate secured to the timber. 2d Securing each side of this plated timber with quarry stone of a large size about — feet or 18 in wide. 3d Filling in the space between the plated timber as a road. If only one railway is made it will be necessary to provide a . . . road.

The whole cost of such a road per mile will be thus:

35 ton of iron @ \$50	1750
30 ft of timber @ \$20	600
paving each side	800
preparing & building road	1000

	\$4150

LAND RECORDS OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, 1679 AND 1680.

Contributed by Louis Dow Scisco.

No special features of local progress are revealed by the land papers of these two years. Accession of a new court clerk brings a noticeable change in the style of the records. Alienation entries of later date were interpolated in the record in 1681 and in 1693.

The items next following are summarized from pages 28 to 54 of Liber I R No. P P, a modern transcription whose contents are derived from a former book that the transcriber calls Liber

LxC No. 1. The liber text abounds in copyist's errors. Despite marginal corrections, there remain evident errors in some of the names and probable errors in others.

Deed, January 7, 1678-79. Arthur Taillor, planter, conveying to Thomas Cooke, planter, the 315-acre tract "Spring Neck" on the north side of Gunpowder River, adjoining land formerly laid out for Robert Taillor. Wife Francis signs with grantor. Witnesses, John Dunston, Deputy Clerk Thomas Hedge. Acknowledged before John Watterton and Henry Haslewood. Wife gives consent before Edward Bedell.

Deed, April 15, 1679, Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County conveying to Thomas James the 100-acre tract "The Forrest" on the west side of Back River which is adjacent to Patapsco River. Witnesses, John Arden, Rowland Thornburgh. Acknowledged by grantor before George Wells and Henry Haslewood, and by Mr. Miles Gibson as attorney for grantor's wife Sarah.

Letter of attorney, February 8, 1678-79, Sarah Gorsuch, understanding by her husband Charles Gorsuch that he has sold 80 acres to John Boren and 100 acres to Thomas James, all on south side of Back River, desires "Cozen Miell Gibson" to acknowledge her consent in court. Witnesses, Howell Powell, John Turner.

Deed, April 15, 1679, Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County conveying to John Boring the 80-acre tract "Swan Harbour" on the west side of Back River which is adjacent to Patapsco River. Witnesses, Thomas James, Rowland Thornburgh. Acknowledged before George Wells and Henry Haslewood by Mr. Miles Gibson as attorney for grantor's wife Sarah.

Letter of attorney, February 8, 1678-79, from Sarah Gorsuch to Miles Gibson is recorded a second time.

Deed, April 15, 1679, John Arthern conveying to Rowland Thornbroufe, planter, the 100-acre tract "Davies fancy" at the head of Howard's Branch at the Middle Branch on north side of Patapsco River, adjoining David Poole's land, it being formerly patented to David Williams. Witnesses, Thomas James, Hendrick Enloes. Grantor John Arden and wife Sarah acknowledge to grantees Rowland Thornborough, and wife consents, before George Wells and Henry Haslewood. Interpolated entry that Clerk Thomas Hedge, for the sheriff, on April 18, 1693, has received from Rowland Thornburgh four shillings for alienation.

Letter of attorney, March 11, 1678-79, Samuell Hatton, gentleman, of Talbot County, appointing Charles Gorsuch of same county, or James Phillips, his attorney to acknowledge in court a conveyance of 400 acres to Miles Gibson; his wife Elizabeth Hatton also appointing Gorsuch or Phillips her attorney to acknowledge consent. Witnesses, Thomas Delahay, William Gane. Deputy Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies acknowledgment made April 15 in court.

Deed, March 11, 1678-79, Samuell Hatton, gentleman, and wife Elizabeth, of Talbot County, for 7,500 pounds of tobacco, conveying to Miles Gibson, gentleman, the 400-acre tract "Persimmon Point" at Rumley Creek, oppo-

site Capt. George Utie's land, it being patented January 7, 1659-60, to James Rigby, cooper. Witnesses, Thomas Delahay, William Gane. Acknowledged April 15 before George Wells and Henry Haslewood by Charles Gorsuch, attorney for grantors.

Letter of attorney, April 9, 1679, Nicholas Gassaway of South River in Anne Arundel County appointing Miles Gibson of Bush River his attorney to assign title and deliver 300 acres to Robert Love of Gunpowder River. Witnesses, Thomas Lightfoot, Thomas Watkins.

Deed, June 3, 1679, Nicholas Gassaway, gentleman, of Anne Arundel County, conveying to Robert Love, planter, the 300-acre tract "Charles his purchase" at Foster's Creek on north side of Gunpowder River, adjoining Arthur Taylor's tract "Georges Hill," it being patented February 27, 1677-78, under a 450-acre land warrant of February 15, 1676-77. Deed signed only by M. Gibson. Witnesses, Michael Judd, Clerk Thomas Hedge. Clerk Hedge certifies that Mr. Miles Gibson as attorney for Capt. Nicholas Gassaway acknowledges before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long, commissioners.

Deed, July 1, 1679, Christopher Tapley, boatwright, conveying to John Durham, planter, the 100-acre tract "Levies Tribe" on south side of Bush River, as patented July 20, 1673, to Tapley and Levy Wharfe, planters, under a 1,600-acre land warrant of April 8, 1672, to Charles James. Witnesses, Thomas Durbin, Clerk Thomas Hedge. Clerk Hedge certifies that grantor acknowledges before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long.

Deed August 4, 1679, Edward Reeves conveying to William Burn 175 acres of the 350-acre tract "The United Friendshipp" at Middle Creek on north side of Gunpowder River, adjoining to land formerly laid out for John Collett, the whole tract being patented July 20, 1677, to Reeves and Lodowick Williams by Gov. Thomas Notley, embracing 175 acres for Reeves under a 471-acre land warrant of May 26, 1676, to George Yate, and 175 acres for Williams under a 200-acre warrant of May 20, 1676, to him. Witnesses, John Cooke, Clerk Thomas Hedge. Clerk Hedge certifies that grantor acknowledges, and wife Ann gives consent, before Maj. Thomas Long and Mr. Miles Gibson, commissioners.

Deed, August 1, 1679, William Hollis of Baltimore County and Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County, planters, conveying to Miles Gibson, planter, the 300-acre tract "Hunting Neck" at the head and on east side of Hunting Creek on east side of Bush River, patented July 1, 1675, to Hollis and Thomas Cole. Witnesses, Francis Lovelace, Peter Ellis. Hollis acknowledges September 2 before John Watterton and Henry Haslewood. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that Mrs. Elizabeth Hollis consents before Mr. Edward Beadle, commissioner.

Deed, August 2, 1679, Peter Ellis, planter, conveying to Simon Dawkins, cooper, 75 acres, being half of the tract "Bever Neck" at Muskeeto Creek, adjoining Capt. Henry Haslewood's plantation, said tract lately possessed by Bernard Utie, afterward by Thomas Overton and wife Jane, and now by Edward Jackson. Witnesses, Henry Haslewood, Edward Bedell. Elizabeth Ellis signs with grantor and consents before Edward

Bedell, commissioner. Acknowledged September 15 before Haslewood and Bedell.

Deed, September 2, 1679, Richard Sims, planter, of Gunpowder River, conveying to Nicholas Hempstead, planter, 100 acres of the 150-acre tract "Sims his Choice," near the head and on south side of Gunpowder River, patented September 28, 1674, to Sims, and adjoining Sims's tract "Swanson." Witnesses, Jacob Jenifer, William Osborne. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that grantor acknowledges November 4 before Col. George Wells, and Maj. Thomas Long, commissioners. Elizabeth Sims consents before John Boreing.

Deed, November 5, 1679, Hendrick Enloes conveying to John Boaring the 100-acre tract "Julose Loyne" on the north side of Back River, adjoining Robert Deman's land. Witnesses, John Hathway, Robert Bengar. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that grantor acknowledges before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long, commissioners, and wife Christian consents before Long.

Confirmation deed, November 23, 1679, John Dickenson of Talbot County, brother of Walter Dickenson of same county, confirms to Thomas Durbin a sale covering the 200-acre tract "Johnston" on north side of Patapsco River, which was patented February 4, 1659-60, to John Dickenson, assigned by him December 23, 1662, to Walter Dickenson, and sold by the latter to Durbin. Witnesses, John Stroud, George Watt.

Letter of attorney, November 23, 1679, John Dickenson of Talbot County appointing as attorney Michael (sic) Gibson or James Phillips to acknowledge in court a sale of 200 acres to Thomas Durbin. Witnesses, John Stroud, George Watt. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that on November 5 (sic) Mr. James Phillips as attorney acknowledges in court.

Deed, December 8, 1679, Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County conveying to David Jones of Baltimore County 1,200 acres in three parcels, as inherited by his wife Sarah Gorsuch under the will of Thomas Cole, first, the 550-acre tract "Coles Harbour" at head of the northwest branch of Patapsco River, second, the 450-acre tract "Maidens Choice," at head of the middle branch of Patapsco River, third, the 200-acre tract "Maryebon," formerly laid out for George Hixon of Baltimore or Anne Arundel County. Sarah Gorsuch signs with grantor. Witnesses, Rowland Thornburgh, Thomas Stone. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that Mr. Miles Gibson, attorney for Charles and Sarah Gorsuch, acknowledges on February 3, 1679-80, before George Wells and Edward Bedell, commissioners.

Clerk's minute, February 4, 1679-80, Clerk Thomas Hedge stating that Mr. Miles Gibson appears in court as attorney for Charles and Sarah Gorsuch to acknowledge sale of 1,200 acres to David Jones and to take acknowledgment of 380 acres sold by Jones to Gorsuch, and also Gibson appears for Ann Jones, wife of David Jones, to acknowledge sale of 380-acre tract to Gorsuch, all being before Col. George Wells and Edward Bedell, commissioners.

Deed, December 8, 1679, David Jones of Baltimore County conveying to Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County the 380-acre tract "Jones his Range"

at Denton Creek on north side of Patapsco River, adjoining land formerly laid out for [Thomas] Thomas and William Battent. Anna Jones signs with grantor. Witnesses, Rowland Thornburgh, Thomas Stone. Grantor and Ann Jones's attorney Mr. Miles Gibson acknowledge February 3, 1679-80, before George Wells and Edward Bedell, commissioners.

Deed, January 31, 1679-80, Solomon Thomas, planter, of Calvert, son and heir of Thomas Thomas, conveying to Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County his share in 1,100 acres called North Point, on the north side of Patapsco River, formerly taken up by Thomas Thomas and William Batten. Witnesses, John Dempill, Thomas Camm. Acknowledged June 1 before George Wells and Edward Bedell, commissioners, by grantor's attorney James Phillips and delivery made to Miles Gibson for grantee.

Deed, February 9, 1679-80, Walter Dickenson of Talbot County conveying to Charles Gorsuch three parcels, first, his share of 1,100 acres near the mouth of Patapsco River, formerly laid out for Thomas Thomas and William Batten; second, the 150-acre tract "Upper Spring Neck" on the east side of Bear Creek on north side of Patapsco River, and near land that grantor formerly bought from Edward Loyd and sold to Abraham Clark; third, the tract "Dickenson" near the great marsh and near the former land of Thomas and Batten. Witnesses, John Smith, Thomas Camm. Acknowledged June 1 before Col. George Wells and Mr. Edward Bedell, commissioners, by grantor's attorney James Phillips and delivery made to Miles Gibson for grantee.

Letter of attorney, February 9, 1679-80, Walter Dickenson of Talbot County appointing Miles Gibson or James Phillips to acknowledge his sale of lands to Charles Gorsuch. Witnesses, John Dickenson, Thomas Camm. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that Walter Dickenson's attorney James Phillips has acknowledged before George Wells and Edward Bedell, commissioners, and made delivery to Mr. Miles Gibson for Gorsuch.

Personal letter, May 26, 1680, Charles Gorsuch requesting "Cozen Gibson" to receive in court from James Phillips an acknowledgment of lands bought from Walter Dickenson and from Solomon Thomas, unless the court objects to Gibson because he is attorney alternate with Phillips, in which case Gorsuch would like Col. Wells to act for him, "and in soe doeing thou wilt oblige thy Loving uncle."

Letter of attorney, January 31, 1679-80, Solomon Thomas of Calvert County appointing Miles Gibson or James Phillips to acknowledge deed to Charles Gorsuch for land formerly taken up by his father Thomas Thomas and William Batten. Witnesses, John Dempill, Thomas Camm. Attested before George Cowley. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that on June 1 James Phillips as attorney acknowledged before Col. George Wells and Mr. Edward Bedell, commissioners, and made delivery to Mr. Gibson for Gorsuch.

Bond, January 31, 1679-80, Solomon Thomas of Calvert County obligating himself to Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County for 36,000 pounds of tobacco, as security that he will perform his covenants in deed of same date. Witnesses, William Gaire, Thomas Biggs.

Deed, July 6, 1680, Miles Gibson, for 7,000 pounds of tobacco, conveying to Daniel Peverell the 300-acre tract "Hunting Neck" on the east side and at head of Hunting Creek on east side of Bush River, formerly owned by Thomas Cole and William Hollis. Witnesses, George Wells, John Watterton. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that grantor's wife Mrs. Ann Gibson consents, and that grantor acknowledges, before Maj. Thomas Long. Interpolated entry that on April 1, 1681, James Thompson, subscriber, has received from Peverell full satisfaction.

Deed, July 5, 1680, Rowland Thornburgh and wife Ann, for 2,000 pounds of tobacco, conveying to William Cromwell the 100-acre tract "Davids Fancy" at Howard's Branch at the Middle Branch on north side of Patapsco River, adjoining David Poole's land. Witnesses, Robert Benger, Thomas Jame. Wife Ann consents before Thomas Long. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that Thornburgh acknowledges before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long, commissioners.

Deed, May 6, 1680, Maj. Thomas Long and wife Jane of Back River, for 4,500 pounds of tobacco, conveying to Thomas Gibson of Charles County 200 acres of the 450-acre tract "—weeke" on Middle River as patented to Long. Witnesses, Jacob Jenifer, William Cromwell. Wife Jane consents July 5 before Mr. John Boring. Long acknowledges before John Watterton and John Boring.

Deed, April 19, 1680, George Holland, gentleman, of Anne Arundel County, conveying to Michael Judd and wife Jane the 300-acre tract "Colletts Neglect" on the north side of Gunpowder River, adjoining the tract "the united Friendshipp" laid out for Edward Reeves and Lodowick Williams. Witnesses, John Tillyard, James Mills.

Letter of attorney, April 19, 1680, George Holland appointing Mr. Jacob Jenifer his attorney to acknowledge and record a deed. Witnesses, John Tillyard, James Mills. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that Jenifer as attorney acknowledges on July 6 before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long.

Deed, October 28, 1680, Charles Gorsuch conveying to Jonas Boen 160 acres of the tract "Willen" at the head of Bear Creek on north side of Patapsco River, laid out for Gorsuch and adjoining to land formerly laid out for Phillip Thomas, late of Anne Arundel County. Witnesses, Miles Gibson, Francis Lovelace, Lewis Barton.

Letter of attorney, October 28, 1680, Charles and Sarah Gorsuch appointing Miles Gibson or James Phillips to acknowledge sale of 160 acres to Jonas Boen. Witnesses, Francis Lovelace, Lewis Barton. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that on November 2 Gibson as attorney acknowledges before Col. George Wells and Maj. Thomas Long, commissioners.

The closing entries of the former Liber I C No. A are now on pages 58 to 62 of the present Liber I S No. I K, having been transcribed from the original record, no longer existent.

Bond and mortgage, April 8, 1675, Lodwick Williams, planter, as security for payment by October 10 next of 1,439 pounds of tobacco, pledging to Mr. Samuel Boston, high sheriff, the 200-acre tract "Williams Ridge" at the head of Bough Creek on south side of Bush River, adjacent to Williams's dwelling plantation. Witnesses, M. Stykellkamp, William Osboarn. Clerk Thomas Hedge certifies that William Osborne acknowledges witnessing execution.

Clerk's minute, undated, that William Osborn makes oath that he witnessed a mortgage and saw Lodwick Williams execute same to Capt. Samuel Boston, high sheriff.

Letter of attorney, December 9, 1679, Charles and Sarah Gorsuch appointing "Cozen Miles Gibson" their attorney to acknowledge their sale of 1,200 acres by deed of December 8, 1679, to "our brother" David Jones; also to receive from David Jones and wife Ann acknowledgment of their deed for 380 acres. Witnesses, Rowland Thornburg, Thomas Stone.

Letter of attorney, December 9, 1679, Ann Jones appointing "my son" Miles Gibson her attorney to acknowledge sale of 380 acres to "my brother" Charles Gorsuch. Witnesses, Rowland Thornburg, Thomas Stone.

Bond, December 8, 1679, Charles Gorsuch of Talbot County obligating himself to David Jones for 40,000 pounds of tobacco as security that he will fulfill the covenants of an indenture of same date with Jones. Witnesses, Rowland Thornburgh, Thomas Stone.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Information wanted concerning Alexander Armstrong and his wife Rachel, who lived at Port Gibson, Claiborne county, Miss. He was an Elder in the Presbyterian Church and died in 1834.

Mrs. Annie Armstrong Dollerhide,
Oak Grove, West Carroll Parish, Louisiana.

Wanted: The date and place of birth and date and place of death of David C. Roscoe who taught book-keeping in Hagerstown, Md., between 1818 and 1831 and who was a member of the 1st regiment Maryland Militia between Aug. 24, 1814 and Oct. 13, 1814. He was the author of "A New and Compendious System of Book-keeping by Double Entry . . ."

Ruth S. Leonard,
921 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Taney and Allied Families. Compiled and privately printed for Katharine T. Silverson. New York, 1935.

The Society is under obligations to the author for this sumptuous work, which is a beautiful specimen of the publisher's art, and especially as it is one of a very small edition of which but few copies will be distributed. As far as we know, it is the only genealogy of the Taney family yet published, and it appears to be well done. Among the allied families included are the Silverson, Grubb, Keedy, Funk, Cheney, Bond, Porter, McBride, Toms, Lyon, Sollers, Partridge, Brooke, Boarman, Jarboe, Hutchins, Marsham, Neale, Doyne and Huntingdon.

Information wanted concerning Evan Hughes and wife, Elizabeth Roberts Hughes of Baltimore or Howard counties; and of Hugh Wharry or Wheary and wife Sarah Gorsuch Wharry of same counties; and of wife of Nehemiah Moxley of A. A. Co.; also Thomas Moxley.

Mrs. Roger Williams,
3445 Mt. Pleasant St., Washington, D. C.

SPECIAL EXHIBIT.

The Maryland Historical Society calls the attention of its members to the special exhibit which has been arranged from September 3rd to October 3rd.

On account of the opening of the new 5th Regiment Armory on September 13th and 14th, and the celebration of the 121st anniversary of the writing of the "Star Spangled Banner," the Society is fortunate in having a wealth of material connected with the British invasion of 1813 and 1814. It has arranged on exhibit the first newspaper publication of the "Star Spangled Banner"; the first copy of the words set to music, published in Baltimore in 1814, only three copies of which are known to exist; many letters of Francis Scott Key; rare prints; maps; banners; swords and other mementoes of the

Battle of North Point, the Bombardment of Fort McHenry, the burning of Havre de Grace; Georgetown and Fredericktown in Kent and Cecil Counties; the Battle of Caulk's Field; the attack on Queenstown and on St. Michael's; the landing of the British at Benedict and the march to Bladensburg; and the burning of Washington.

As a special exhibit the descendants of Commodore John Rodgers have loaned the Maryland Historical Society a large part of the original set of solid silver presented to Commodore John Rodgers in 1814 by the Citizens of Baltimore "in testimony of their high sense of the important aid afforded by him in the defense of Baltimore on the 12th and 13th of September 1814."

In addition, portraits by Gilbert Stuart, Jarvis and Siebert have been loaned by his descendants and various sets of silver, swords, decorations and mementoes of this notable Maryland family assembled for this occasion.

Through the courtesy of the Walters Art Gallery, the Peabody Institute, the Enoch Pratt Free Library, the Remington Rand Co., cases have been loaned to the Society, in which these exhibits have been placed.

As it is a temporary exhibit it is hoped that members of the Society will avail themselves of the opportunity of inspecting this most remarkable collection.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIFE MEMBERSHIPS.

(Life Memberships go to Endowment Fund.)

Jane James Cook, for current expenses of rehabilitation,	\$1,000
Mary Parkhurst Hayden, bequest.	400
National Society Daughters of Founders and Patriots for mounting and binding Williams Papers, . . .	177
For mounting and binding Carroll Papers, . . .	620
Mrs. D'Arcy Paul, for repair and restoration of maps,	200
Benjamin H. Griswold, Jr. Purchase of Paca Co. broadsides,	30
Mrs. Nannie Ball Nimmo, for binding Debt Book of 1750,	5
William Woodward, Life membership	100
Miss Ida Bell Gaither,	100

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR IN MARYLAND, 1753 TO 1756. <i>By Paul H. Giddens,</i>	281
A GAZETTEER OF MARYLAND, A. D. 1673. <i>By J. Louis Kuethe,</i>	310
EARLY RECORDS OF THE CHURCH AND PARISH OF ALL FAITHS. <i>By Henry J. Berkley,</i>	326
LIEUT. NOAH DIXON WALKER TO HIS FATHER NOAH WALKER,	363
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY,	367
NOTES AND QUERIES,	370

Committee on Publications

SAMUEL K. DENNIS, *Chairman*

JOHN M. VINCENT,

J. HALL PLEASANTS.

LOUIS H. DIELMAN,
Editor.